Volume 1
Pages 1 - 215

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. ALSUP

ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,)
Plaintiff,)
VS.) No. C 10-3561 WHA
GOOGLE, INC.,)
Defendant.)
San Francisco, California Monday, May 9, 2016

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff: ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

The Orrick Building 405 Howard Street

San Francisco, California 94105

BY: ANNETTE L. HURST, ESQUIRE GABRIEL M. RAMSEY, ESQUIRE

(Appearances continued on next page)

Reported By: Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR #5812, RMR, CRR

Pamela A. Batalo, CSR No. 3593, RMR, FCRR Official Reporters - U.S. District Court

1	APPEARANCES (CONTINUED)	:
2	For Plaintiff:	ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP The Orrick Building
3		51 West 52nd Street New York, New York 10019
4	BY:	PETER A. BICKS, ESQUIRE LISA T. SIMPSON, ESQUIRE
5		ORACLE
6 7	BY:	500 Oracle Parkway Redwood City, California 94065 DORIAN ESTELLE DALEY, GENERAL COUNSEL
8	BI:	MATTHEW SARBORARIA, VICE PRESIDENT and ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL
9		ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
10	DV -	2050 Main Street, Suite 1100 Irvine, California 92614-8255 CHRISTINA VON DER AHE RAYBURN, ESQUIRE
11	For Defendant:	KEKER & VAN NEST
12	FOI Delendant:	633 Battery Street San Francisco, California 94111-1809
13	BY:	·
14		MICHAEL S. KWUN, ESQUIRE DANIEL PURCELL, ESQUIRE
15		MATTHIAS ANDREAS KAMBER, ESQUIRE EUGENE MORRIS PAIGE, ESQUIRE
16		KING & SPALDING LLP
17		1185 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036-4003
18	BY:	BRUCE W. BABER, ESQUIRE
19		GOOGLE, INC. 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway
20	BY:	Mountain View, California 94043 RENNY HWANG, LITIGATION COUNSEL
21	Also Present:	
22	<u>50 11050110</u> .	GEORGES SAAB ORACLE CORPORATE REPRESENTATIVE
23		CATHERINE LACAVERA
24		GOOGLE CORPORATE REPRESENTATIVE
25		

Monday - May 9, 2016 1 7:30 a.m. 2 PROCEEDINGS ---000---3 (The following proceedings were held in open court, 4 5 outside the presence of the jury:) 6 **THE COURT:** Good morning. Have a seat, please. Let's call the case. 7 THE CLERK: Calling CV 10-3561-WHA, Oracle America, 8 9 Inc. vs. Google, Inc. The matter is on for a jury trial, jury selection this 10 11 morning. Counsel, please state your appearances for the record. 12 13 MR. BICKS: Good morning, Your Honor. Peter Bicks from Orrick for Oracle. And you know Annette Hurst. Mark 14 15 Phillips will be helping me this more. Matt Sarboraria you 16 have met from Oracle, Lisa Simpson, Gabe Ramsey, and Georges 17 Saab, who is going to be the corporate representative. 18 Say the name of the representative. THE COURT: MR. BICKS: Georges Saab. S-A-A-B. 19 20 Welcome to all of you. And? THE COURT: Okay. MR. VAN NEST: Good morning, Your Honor. 21 Bob 22 Van Nest, Keker & Van Nest, for Google, and I'm here with a 23 number of people whom you met. Christa Anderson, Dan Purcell,

The last name again?

Matthias Kamber.

THE COURT:

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VAN NEST: Kamber, K-A-M-B-E-R. Michael Kwun. Mike Tiktinsky is helping us this morning, and our corporate representative from Google is Katherine Lacavera. She was here I should introduce Reed Mullen. last time as well. We don't have enough chairs. And Maya Karwande. THE COURT: I guess you will just have to stand. MR. VAN NEST: I will yield shortly. THE COURT: I see the famous file cabinet over there. MR. VAN NEST: It will remain standing. THE COURT: All right. Welcome to all of you. here for trial, jury trial, and we will get started as soon as the jury assembly room is ready to send them down. I apologize to those of you in the public seating area. I'm going to need all of that section over there so you three will have to move over here in order -- or move someplace because I need that whole section for the jury, plus a couple of rows over there, but once we get the jury selected, we'll have plenty of room, I'm sure, for everyone. But that's probably going to take at least half of today to get the jury selected. What items can I help you with this morning before we call in the jury? MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, we have one agreement on the questionnaire for automatic strikes. You had asked us to try to agree on that.

THE COURT: 1 Yes. 2 MR. VAN NEST: I do have a question on the questionnaire, Question 9F, as in Frank, which is, "If you are 3 4 personally acquainted with a witness, " and assuming that it's 5 the right witness, the witness is the actual person that 6 they're acquainted with, that's the -- the parties agree that 7 person can be automatically excused from the questionnaire as long as it's clear that they've identified --8 This is Question 9D? 9 THE COURT: MR. VAN NEST: 10 9F. 11 THE COURT: 9F? MR. VAN NEST: Potential witnesses. 12 13 THE COURT: Well, how about Question 9D? MR. VAN NEST: B? 14 15 D. We're already going to put the THE COURT: No. people who have a strong opinion on 9D or E -- we're going to 16 17 put them in the back of the room; right? MR. VAN NEST: That's right. 18 19 MR. BICKS: Right. 20 All right. But then on automatic THE COURT: 21 exclusions, we're going to just automatically excuse anyone who circles a name on the back side, but we have to check to make 22 23 sure it's somebody who is really in the case. That's right. That's right. 24 MR. VAN NEST: 25 THE COURT: So I may have to -- you won't have the

```
benefit of the questionnaires at the time I do that quizzing.
 1
     The juror is going to be standing right there, and I will just
 2
     have to ask enough questions to satisfy you that it's the same
 3
 4
     person.
 5
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             That's right.
              THE COURT: Let's look at Number 9D or E. Could I
 6
 7
     convince you that we should just excuse automatically anybody
     on 9D or E who answers yes to either D or E?
 8
              MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, I would prefer to wait and
 9
     see how the selection shakes out and how many people we have.
10
11
     And I don't know how many people are going to be in that
     category, but I'd prefer to follow the procedure you indicated.
12
              THE COURT: All right. If you don't agree, both of
13
     you don't agree, I'm not going to do it. What's going to
14
15
     happen is you both are going to play games and you're going to
16
     say oh, that person is favoring our side. Oh, we've got to
     fight like hell to keep them in the venire, and then you're
17
18
     both going to have that situation and then you're both going to
     waste a lot of time trying to save somebody who can't be saved,
19
    but who knows.
20
          All right. At least we'll have them sent to the end of
21
     the line.
22
23
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             That's right.
```

THE COURT: So we have -- thank you for the -- that's

the only one you could come up with an automatic exclusion on?

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. VAN NEST: That's right. We had a disagreement about 9C. 9C was, "Had you or a loved one within the last 10 years been employed, owned stock." I think Google is okay with an automatic strike there, but I think Oracle wanted some further examination on that. We'd be okay with automatically disqualifying those people, too. MR. BICKS: We have a concern there, Your Honor. It's just that ten years, are we going to lose people that would be good to keep? If it's somebody current, it seems like an easy call, but if we're going back that far, is it helpful to have a larger group here? THE COURT: Okay. So let's -- are we done on this? MR. VAN NEST: Yes. All right. What else can I help you with? THE COURT: Can I, Your Honor, just raise a couple MR. BICKS: questions I had, just so I know? THE COURT: Yes. First of all, if there are privacy issues MR. BICKS: that come up during the voir dire, what is the Court's preference for how we handle that? I don't want to overdo it, but I -- on the other hand, I want to know what you expect and what's the best way to handle it. Give me an example of what you mean? THE COURT: We ask somebody a question and you can see MR. BICKS: that they're kind of feeling uncomfortable about answering and

there is some indication that they may want to discuss it in private, something along those lines.

THE COURT: Well, you can ask them would they prefer to go over that in private. Now, it can't be in private. It will just be more private.

MR. BICKS: Right.

THE COURT: Because we'll still have at least two lawyers and me and the court reporter, and it may, depending on the circumstances, be that it's in open court if it's during a break when most people are out having a break.

Most of that front row there I'm going to need now for the jury, so you have got to give that up.

So just ask them that question and probably they'll say yeah, that would be better.

MR. BICKS: Understood.

And when we do the individual follow-up -- let's say, for example, somebody has strong feelings about a witness or something like that and we have to caucus or take it up with Your Honor, would that come out of -- that would come out of the time of the side who is doing the *voir dire*?

THE COURT: Yes. But if it reaches the point of unfairness to that person, to that lawyer, then I will probably give them a little more time. But I -- yes. If you're the one asking questions and it requires a sidebar, yeah, that comes out of your time.

MR. BICKS: Okay. And one issue I can just anticipate kind of, given the kind of the neutral statement and the posture of the case, is that there's a good shot that some people kind of will be thinking that Google is kind of starting out behind here because of the -- what the Court has -- what everybody agrees in terms of kind of the instruction on the copyright infringement. I'm just raising now whether or not that kind of a leaning -- I don't think that should be kind of an automatic strike for cause on the Google side until we have an opportunity to discuss it with the individual.

THE COURT: I'm not going to give them the jury instruction on fair use, one we have had so many rounds on. That comes later. That is not going to come during the voir dire. Did you think that was going to come during the voir dire?

MR. BICKS: We have the shorter neutral statement.

THE COURT: The half-page statement.

MR. BICKS: Yes. I can kind of see that issue coming up during the *voir dire*. And my only observation of that is I just don't think if the posture of this is people are hearing okay, so, you know, we've got --

THE COURT: You are asking me to rule on a hypothetical. I'd have to hear how -- look at the body language and everything else to see what I thought about it. I can't say positively that that's -- we'll just have to see.

```
MR. BICKS:
 1
                          Okay.
                          I'm not going to give you a ruling on that
 2
              THE COURT:
 3
     yet.
              MR. BICKS:
                          Thank you.
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                          I don't see that as likely to come up, but
 6
     maybe.
             Let's wait and see how it comes up in the exact wording
 7
     of the questions.
                          Thank you.
 8
              MR. BICKS:
              THE COURT:
                         What else?
 9
              MR. BICKS: We've exchanged graphics yesterday for the
10
11
     openings and they're pretty minor issues on both sides, but
     since I would be the one who is going first, I would want to
12
13
     have those issues cleared up. There are only one or two pretty
     minor ones, but --
14
15
                         Let's get into that then.
              THE COURT:
16
          Dawn, can you check down there to see how they are doing
17
     timewise.
              THE CLERK: Oh, it's going to take them a while,
18
             They're right next door --
19
20
              THE COURT: We have some -- probably have 20-plus
     minutes, maybe 30 minutes, so we can get into your opening --
21
22
     let's do it. Let's do it right now. What's the first issue?
23
              MR. BICKS: Bob, are you still on the Bob Lee thing?
              MR. VAN NEST:
24
                             No.
25
          I wanted to talk about one of the slides, Your Honor.
                                                                  Ι
```

can either hand it up or we can put it on the graphic, if we 1 could get control of it, or I can hand it up to Your Honor. 2 I don't have a clerk at this moment. THE COURT: 3 young lady here who just came forward -- here we go. 4 5 got somebody. Thank you. What shall I do? 6 MR. VAN NEST: We had some discussion about this 7 earlier. They have an exhibit, which I'm showing you there, 8 which is written by a man named Makowski. Mr. Makowski was at 9 10 Apache Software Foundation when he wrote this. He was never 11 disclosed on any Rule 26 whatsoever. This document was produced by Apache. Oracle subpoenaed Apache back in 2011. 12 They received the document from Apache. They never followed 13 up, they never asked to take a deposition --14 Just a second. Is that true, that you are 15 THE COURT: 16 trying to put a witness on who was not disclosed under Rule 26? 17 MR. BICKS: That is not correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: Show me the initial disclosure or 18 19 supplement thereto that disclosed this witness. 20 So this is actually Google's October --MR. BICKS: 21 disclosure from --I asked for yours first. 22 THE COURT: 23 MR. BICKS: Well, they disclosed the people from Apache and then we do a me, too and say each side buys into the 24

other's disclosures. This fellow is a Google employee.

25

```
Was he closed by Google?
 1
              THE COURT:
 2
              MR. BICKS:
                          Yes.
              THE COURT:
                          Is that true?
 3
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             I don't believe so.
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                          Well, take a look at whatever document it
 6
     is Mr. Bicks has got there.
              MR. BICKS: And so the Court knows what I'm referring
 7
     to, there is a disclosure by Google where they identify all
 8
     employees or former directors, officers of Apache, and this
 9
     individual was a former director of Apache, and as
10
11
     Your Honor -- I think we've discussed. He works at Google.
     He's been at Google for -- since July of 2010, and he was --
12
     he's been subpoenaed to testify on this document, which
13
     Your Honor knows about.
14
15
              THE COURT:
                          I know the document and I think it's a
16
     potentially-important document in the case, but I tell the
17
     lawyers from day one, you must disclose under Rule 26.
                                And what I'm saying, Your Honor, is
18
              MR. BICKS: Yes.
19
     that this individual -- these -- this group of folks, all the
20
     folks from Apache have been disclosed by Google going back to
21
     2011.
22
              THE COURT:
                          Well --
23
              MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, he was never disclosed by
24
     name.
            There's a --
25
              THE COURT: How did you -- see, here's the problem.
                                                                    Ι
```

hate it when the lawyers do this.

What made you think that your disclosure was good enough whenever you did a group disclosure?

MR. VAN NEST: We disclosed the Foundation, including, but not limited to, Geir Magnusson. So we disclosed an individual whom they could have deposed and didn't. That's not this individual. They had the document. It was obtained from a third party, from Apache. Neither side disclosed this witness, Makowski. Neither side asked for his depo. Neither side took a depo. He was never on a disclosure that Oracle filed ever from day one, last trial, this trial, at any time. And now they want to jam it in --

THE COURT: It doesn't matter about the last trial so much. They could have updated it between the last four years.

There an opportunity to say here is our supplement to our Rule 26.

MR. VAN NEST: That's right. We both supplemented, and he has never been on any supplemental ever. I object to that slide because it comes in only through him.

THE COURT: What else do you have to say?

MR. BICKS: My point, Your Honor, is that he's -- this witness -- this has been disclosed by them. And --

THE COURT: That disclosure doesn't count. I would have ruled that disclosure bogus and void from day one. If that's what you're relying on -- look, if you didn't list him

by name someplace, at least for opening purposes, you can't use this. You can't spring this on me at the opening statement stage.

MR. BICKS: But, Your Honor, just so we're clear, the 26 disclosures are the ones that we've discussed, but he was identified when we were exchanging witness lists back in April, and we have been discussing this document in court for like the last -- over the last month. So everyone has known about him --

THE COURT: Okay. But was he disclosed under Rule 26 like the rule requires, like the Federal Rules of -- this is not my rule. This is the national rule. It says you've got to do it and you can supplement for good cause. You probably would have had good cause to supplement.

I'm not going to make a final ruling on whether you can use this testimony or this document. I'm going to say you cannot use it in the opening. I'm going to need more time, and I'm going to make you lawyers brief it, and here's some of the things that would be useful to me.

To find out every instance in which Google has gotten away with something like you're trying to get away with because I'm not going to let them have it both ways. I just cannot fathom the idea that you think you can make a group disclosure under Rule 26. You have to identify the specific people.

MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, that's the only issue I

had --1 THE COURT: All right. 2 MR. VAN NEST: -- on the opening slides --3 THE COURT: I'm going to make the same ruling on 4 5 your -- you cannot use that testimony on your opening about 6 transformative because that was an argumentative question. Ι 7 may not let you even use it period, but I haven't heard your argument on it yet. That's my tentative ruling. 8 Tell me what your argument is. 9 Here's the thing, Your Honor. This is 10 MR. VAN NEST: 11 no different than their asking our witnesses whether Android is commercial, whether APIs are creative. 12 Bob Lee -- they have a slide which -- from Bob Lee, who is 13 a Google employee, where he says, We took the good stuff from 14 15 Java. That's also a question where it's taken out of context. 16 The reason -- Mr. Barr has been at Sun for almost 20 17 years. He was designated by them as a witness. He is a senior principal technologist. He is out there writing a blog 18 19 congratulating Android. He says on the blog, "I still applaud 20 Google for the effort. The mobile industry is in the midst of 21 a major shift and Android is an embodiment of that shift." That was the blog that he posted. 22 23 THE COURT: I'm not saying he can't use the blog.

What I'm saying is that snippet about transformative where the

witness himself says what do you mean by transformative and --

24

25

it's just taking -- like *commercial* is a normal word, but transformative is one that has possibly special legal meaning and is not a normal word, and I just think you -- the witness never gave a definition of what he meant by it.

MR. VAN NEST: Well, he did, though --

THE COURT: It's more argumentive than it is probative.

MR. VAN NEST: He did though, Your Honor. He did in the sense that he was asked -- he asked the examiner to clarify what it means, and the examiner said:

"In other words, did it change the status quo in a very significant way when it came out?

- "A The status quo of the mobile industry, yes.
- **"Q.** Was Android transformative?
- "A. I think I already answered that, that I believe in some ways, yes."

He asked for clarification and he got it. This is no different than the quote they have from Bob Lee on the good stuff. That's the same sort of thing. He wants to know what does good stuff mean, what are we talking about. I'm not sure why transformative is different from saying is this the good stuff, is this the good stuff from Java or different from saying is this creative, is an API creative. It's the same -- it's the same point for all of them, and there ought to be -- if they're going to get to get up and put in their opening Bob

```
Lee, the good stuff from Java, an expert saying yeah, it's creative, I don't know why Mr. Barr, who is a witness they designated and has been at Sun for 20 years, can't be on the same plane. It's the same sort of thing, both sides.
```

MR. BICKS: Your Honor, some of that is just frankly not accurate. This individual was not designated. He's not a senior executive. He expressly says it in his deposition, Transformative is a really vague term so I'm not sure if I can even answer that."

As the Court knows better than the parties, the definition of transformative in this case is a specific phrase that is very complex and very nuanced. That's a very different issue than asking somebody who actually put in an email when they described these packages that they were good stuff, normal English language, and he was asked are they the good stuff and he said they're the good stuff. That testimony was actually admitted at the last trial.

So words like good stuff and commercial are very different than this definition, which is complex, where a witness already said --

THE COURT: Are you going to use good stuff in your opening statement?

MR. BICKS: Yes. And he -- I thought we were okay with me doing that.

MR. VAN NEST: I think they should either both be in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

They're on the same plane. or both be out. That's what I told counsel last night. They should either both be in or both be It's not fair to let him put someone up on that and not allow me to show a very direct and clear response from a witness who asked for clarification, got it, and made the statement. This is --THE COURT: Who said *good stuff*? A fellow named Bob Lee. MR. BICKS: He is at which company? THE COURT: MR. BICKS: He is at Google, Your Honor, and he was one of the lead platform designers here, and it was a pretty straightforward question, Your Honor. THE COURT: What factor does good stuff go to? Factor 3? MR. BICKS: Yeah. It's important. It's actually, frankly, from my view in terms of helping a jury understand this, simple stuff like that I think can be easier to understand than some of the complex technical language. Well, did he go further to say that the THE COURT: implementing code was the bad stuff? I don't think he was asked that, Judge. MR. BICKS: He was asked a pretty straightforward question: "Would you agree that the Java APIs that Android supports are good stuff from Java?

```
"Answer:
                    Yes."
 1
          This was played at the trial.
 2
                         Look, I thought you said it was omitted at
              THE COURT:
 3
     the last trial.
 4
 5
              MR. BICKS:
                          No.
                               It was played.
                          Admitted. I thought you said omitted.
              THE COURT:
 6
 7
              MR. BICKS:
                         No, no, no. Admitted.
              THE COURT: All right. You know, that is worth
 8
     something, but I can't -- maybe there wasn't an objection last
 9
10
     time.
11
              MR. VAN NEST: There was.
                                         I mean, this is -- the good
     stuff was in an email that Mr. Lee didn't even write, and he is
12
     asking for the same kind of clarification that Mr. Barr did.
13
     He has asked okay -- he's read an email that someone else
14
15
     wrote:
16
          "They take good stuff from Java into their own little
17
     Ecosystem.
18
          "What good stuff from Java are you referring to there?
          "I'm not sure," says the witness.
19
          "Would you agree that Android took the good stuff from
20
21
     Java?
22
          "Object. Could you be more specific?
23
          "Yes. Would you agree" -- question, "Would you agree that
     Android uses Java APIs?
24
25
          "Answer: It certainly supports certain Java APIs.
```

```
1
          "Would you agree that the Java APIs that Android supports
     are good stuff from Java?
 2
          "Object to form.
 3
          "Answer:
                  Yes."
 4
 5
          He's also asking for clarification throughout on what good
     stuff means. So these two witnesses are on an equal footing,
 6
 7
     and I, frankly, don't care whether they're both in or both out.
              THE COURT: Are you going to read to the jury the
 8
    pre-instruction that I'm going to give on fair use?
 9
                          I'm quoting some of it, yes. But I gather
10
              MR. BICKS:
11
     they are, too. I'm not going to be going over the top with it,
     Your Honor. I get your direction. It's --
12
13
              THE COURT:
                          They're both -- Mr. Van Nest has a point.
     Good stuff, that's like What do you keep in your liquor
14
15
     cabinet?
              Where do you keep the good stuff? As opposed to the
16
     what kind of stuff.
17
              MR. VAN NEST: The question right before it,
     Your Honor -- his answer is -- he's asked:
18
          "Would you agree that Android took good stuff from Java
19
     into its own private Ecosystem?
20
          "Answer: I would object vehemently. It's Apache
21
     licensing so it's completely free so it didn't take anything
22
23
     into a private Ecosystem."
              THE COURT: Who said that, the lawyer?
24
25
              MR. VAN NEST: No.
                                  This is Mr. Lee, the witness.
```

This is what they're not showing.

Then he is asked:

"Would you agree that Android took good stuff from Java?

"Answer: Could you be more specific. What do you mean?

"Yes, okay, I'll be more specific."

Both of you get to use it, but you have to have the full page or so of that kind of argumenting back. You can't just take a snippet. You got to put in all of that that Mr. Van Nest read and then you've got to put on -- about transformative, you've got to start back there with the questions about Apple, and then where he says that's a vague term, what does that mean, you've got to put all that down, water it down with all of those -- the true transcript as opposed to the snippet, and then you need on the Van Nest side -- you've got to say now, the judge will instruct you on what the term transformative means. And then you've got to read it.

Somewhere in your opening, you've got to read the entire paragraph on what transformative is so that it will -- the scales will fall from the eyes of the jury and they will see that the definition that you gave them in the depo was not quite the same one that I'm going to give them.

So if you think it's still worth using after all that, you can go for it. And you've got to read factor 3 to the jury so that they can see that the phrase good stuff does not appear

```
anywhere in the definition and then -- so there.
                                                       That way
 1
     there won't be any misleading of the jury by either side.
 2
              MR. VAN NEST: I think you just shortened up the
 3
     openings there a little bit, Your Honor. Thank you.
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                         Well, you both -- one of you can decide to
     do it, but you've got to do the complete package.
 6
 7
              MR. VAN NEST: We get the idea.
              THE COURT:
                         All right. What else can I help you with?
 8
              MR. BICKS:
                          I think that's it.
 9
              MR. VAN NEST: The other thing that we should spend
10
11
     just a minute on, Your Honor, we have now started to exchange
     deposition designations, and we have a couple of sets to hand
12
     up to Your Honor where we need your quidance.
13
14
              THE COURT: Fine. Hand them up.
              MR. VAN NEST: I would ask Mr. Mullen to step forward.
15
16
     That's the other thing we can spend time on briefly.
17
              THE COURT: All right. Is there a packet?
              MR. MULLEN: Good morning, Your Honor. Three packets,
18
19
     actually.
20
              THE COURT: When will these be read to the jury? When
     are they going to come up?
21
              MR. VAN NEST: I don't think they'll come up -- I'm
22
23
     expecting that we won't do any evidence today. If we ended up
     with a few minutes today, we'd read Mr. Ellison, but apart from
24
25
     that, they won't come up until Wednesday at the earliest,
```

Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. VAN NEST: So I wouldn't expect any of them to be done tomorrow or today. Probably Wednesday at the earliest.

THE COURT: You gave me four and not three.

MR. MULLEN: There is trial testimony and a deposition transcript for Mr. Ellison, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. MULLEN: Those both go together. And that actually, if I could, I just wanted to raise an issue that the parties have had so far in dealing with designations. It came to a head with Mr. Ellison's deposition designations. He is unavailable this week. That's okay. We're going to play his deposition, and we designated the testimony that we wanted to play.

Oracle has added a whole bunch of designations that they're calling completeness, but they really don't go to completeness at all. I think completeness is a line or two of deposition testimony. They have several lines and sometimes full pages that they're calling completeness.

It's an issue with Mr. Ellison's deposition and it's also an issue with several other witnesses whom we have designated, and we would like to kind of cut that off at the head before it gets --

THE COURT: To give you -- the kind of thing that I

just said that Mr. Van Nest would have to read about Apple and 1 iOS and transformative and all of that would be required under 2 the Rule of Completeness. On the other hand, things that are 3 sideswipes and you don't really need to get to the meaning of 4 5 what the testimony you want to offer, that's not Rule of 6 Completeness. So do you have something to say? What is your name? 7 MS. VON DER AHE: Good morning, Your Honor. Christine 8 Von der Ahe on behalf of Oracle. 9 We believe the completeness designations we did for Oracle 10 11 are completely within the guidelines you set forth. THE COURT: I will have to look at it unless you too 12 think you could look at it again and agree. What I usually 13 just say is in/out. Two letters, three letters and then I 14 15 don't give long explanations. Sometimes I give no explanation. 16 I just say in/out. When I hand it back, you'll see that's the 17 only practical way to do it. And I will see if I can get through -- what is the -- let me put these in the order that we 18 19 need them first. You want Ellison first; right? 20 MR. MULLEN: Yes, Your Honor. I will put him on the top of the stack. 21 THE COURT: Who would be next? 22 MR. MULLEN: I think Mr. Duimovich, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: I will take him next. I will do them in 24

25

that order. Great.

Okay.

MS. VON DER AHE: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I want to come back to the -- the memo from the guy at Apache. Right now I'm only ruling that you can't use it in the opening. I'm not saying it won't come in at trial. And it disturbs me that this was not -- they were not disclosed, but -- so I want -- I do not want someone to have it both ways and be using this as a gimmick.

So we're going to have a further argument over this before it gets to the stage where you're putting on your case. So we have some time. But if I'm going to be this hard on Oracle, which is what the rule calls for, Mr. Van Nest, I'm going to be just as hard on Google. So when the day comes that you need some flexibility under Rule 26, too bad for you.

So you need to be -- this is usually the kind of thing good lawyers work out. But if I've got to do it by the rule, I'm going to be just as hard on you. And when I say hard, I'm not being -- I'm just doing what the rule says.

MR. VAN NEST: Understood, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Shall we bring in our venire?

THE CLERK: They just told me it's five minutes.

They're printing out the list and they will be here in five minutes.

THE COURT: All right. Those of you in the back of the room, I think we're going to need those seats. And I'm

```
sorry that we don't have more space in here, but after we get
 1
     the jury selected, we'll have more space than we need.
 2
          We'll take, let's say, a five-minute break and get the
 3
     jury all in here and then we'll get started.
 4
 5
                       (Recess taken at 8:01 a.m.)
                    (Proceedings resumed at 8:26 a.m.)
 6
              THE COURT: Everyone be seated. And welcome to all of
 7
         It's a big crowd today. Thank you for coming out. And
 8
     the first order of business is for the clerk to call the roll
 9
     and make sure know who's here and then to -- before doing that,
10
11
     to swear you in.
          So I'm going to turn things over to Dawn Logan, who will
12
13
     do that part.
                          Thank you, Your Honor. All right, when
14
              THE CLERK:
15
     you hear your name, please just acknowledge that you are here.
16
                     (Roll call taken)
17
              THE CLERK: Anybody here who I did not call? Everyone
     has been called.
18
              THE COURT:
                          Somebody raised their hand.
19
              THE CLERK:
                          Your name?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR AGUILAR: Manuel Aguilar.
21
                          I don't have Aguilar on the list.
              THE CLERK:
22
23
     jury person staff is here to take you back to the jury office.
                          Anybody?
24
              THE COURT:
                                    Okay.
25
              THE CLERK: I will administer the oath, Your Honor.
```

I'm going to administer an oath to all the perspective jurors,	
and I would ask that you please stand, raise your right hand to)
follow the oath.	

Prospective Jurors Sworn

THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.

District Court for the Northern District of California, which runs all the way from Monterey up to the Oregon border and about halfway into the state. So welcome to you and thank you for coming out on this misty May morning.

All right. Welcome again to your U.S.

We're going to start things off right by having the case called and asking counsel to make their appearances.

Dawn, would you please call the case.

THE COURT:

THE CLERK: Of course, Your Honor. Thank you. It's Civil 10-3561-WHA, Oracle America, Inc. vs. Google, Inc.

Counsel, please go ahead and state your appearances for the record.

MR. BICKS: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning, everyone. My name is Peter Bicks. And I would like to introduce you to some folks at my table here.

This is Matt Sarboraria and Georges Saab. They are both with Oracle. This is my colleague, Gabe Ramsey, and over to the corner over here, Lisa Simpson and Annette Hurst and then Mark Phillips.

THE COURT: All right.

1 MR. BICKS: Thank you, Your Honor. Thank you, Mr. Bicks. 2 THE COURT: And? 3 MR. VAN NEST: Good morning, Your Honor. 4 5 Good morning everyone. My name is Bob Van Nest from Keker & Van Nest, and I'm here on behalf of Google, and our Google 6 7 representative is Katherine Lacavera from Google. And with me at counsel table are Christa Anderson, Dan Purcell, Matthias 8 Kamber, Michael Kwun, and Mike Tiktinsky. 9 Thank you, Your Honor. 10 MR. VAN NEST: 11 THE COURT: Thank you. It will take a while to get 12 selected to serve on the jury will know who's who. 13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

all the names of the lawyers down, but eventually those of you

But just to give you a very brief summary, this side of the room is Oracle America, Inc., Oracle America Inc. side of the room is Google, Inc. Google. And those are the -then you met the lawyers. We'll get their names down in due So there we go. course.

I need to do something right off the bat and give you a direct order. I hate to give a direct order to jurors because I have so much respect for the jury and the jury system and every one of you individually.

This is a high profile case. There has been a lot of publicity about this case, and both sides have been waiting months, even more than that, for their day in court.

have the newspapers and the magazines.

And my direct order to you is you may not, you must not, you cannot go out and do any research or, to use a bad phrase in this case, Google anything having to do with this case. If you do, it will be a direct violation, and I have to hold you in contempt. I would hate to do that.

But there's a good reason for this order, and that is that whoever is selected to serve has to decide the case based on the evidence here in the courtroom and not upon any stuff, including propaganda, that you hear on the Internet or see on the Internet or read in the newspapers. This case has to be decided on what's presented here under the Rules of Evidence and not on anything, any search outside the courtroom.

Similarly, you cannot talk with anyone about the case, even each other. Those of you who are selected to serve on the jury will have a duty to talk about the case at the end of it during deliberations, but not before that.

So you can't talk with your loved ones, other than to say you're serving on this case. You could tell them the name of the case, but no talking about the case, even with your loved ones.

So to come back to the -- I just know how half of you are so into your cell phones and trying to Google stuff and go on Facebook. You cannot do any of that. You cannot put on Facebook or your social media page that you're on this case as

a juror or even being considered as a juror. You cannot do that. And that's because you would start getting comments from your friends or maybe friends of your friends: Oh, that's great; oh, that's terrible. Whatever they would say. You cannot do that.

Now, part of the good news of this is that these excellent lawyers on both sides have both agreed with the Court that they will not try during -- what sometimes happens in jury selection is to do searches on you, so they're not going to be going out while you're being considered to serve on the jury and searching your background on social media. So you're safe there. Until the very end of the case, then you and the lawyers and everyone in the world can do all the research they want to do once the verdict is in.

So they will then go back, maybe, and look and see everything that you wrote, make a motion for a mistrial if you did something -- some misconduct. I don't know. But they can do it then, but they've agreed not to do it until that point, and you can't do it either, but once you're free from your jury service, then of course you can go -- you can hold a press conference, if you want. You can write a book about the case. I don't care. But you can't do it before that.

Now, the lawyers, these excellent lawyers, have both agreed that they will not be doing that, but I cannot promise you about the press. Somewhere in the room we've got members

of the press and we've got members of the public, and those people who have nothing to do with the lawyers presenting the case, they can Google you all day long if they want.

So at some point, if you know how to adjust your privacy settings on your Facebook, if you have that, you might want to do that. But that's up to you.

I can't control the press. They're not subject to any of my orders, and if they want to look you up and see what you've said or whatever, that's their right, and they will not be restricted in any way, but if you want to give yourself more privacy, you can adjust your privacy settings on Instagram or whatever, one of those Twitter -- whatever service that you particularly like.

I think the world of jurors, but I have to tell you, I'm deadly serious about this. If I find out that you have violated the Court's order and done research on the case or made comments on Facebook or anything else, it will be contempt of court and you will put me in a terrible position of having to sentence you to some kind of community service or whatever and make you -- you don't want to put me in that position.

Please honor this. Please honor this. The temptation, because it is a high-profile case, will be enormous and you must resist it and not do it. All right. Enough said on that.

Okay. We're going to go now to what are we here for today. We are here to select a jury. We need 10 of you to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT:

What?

```
serve, so we've a lot more than we need, and we will spend
probably up until close to 11:30 or noon on this jury selection
         And the whole point is to ask you questions and to
process.
see if you would be fair and impartial to both sides and follow
the law and the instructions that I will give you about the law
and then be a good conscientious juror and decide the case.
     So that's what we will be doing. And rather than explain
it to you, you just have to see how it unfolds. That's the
best way to do it.
     The first item of business, I want to get rid of anybody
who's sick and can get the rest of you contagious.
                                                    If you have
the flu, a bad hacking cough, bronchitis, you've got to raise
your hand right now. Come up here. I'm going to interview.
Remember, all of you are under oath. I rarely have people who
try to get out of jury service by claiming they're not --
they're sick when they're not.
     Right here. Right here. Go up to the microphone.
     Tell me your name, please.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLD: Mark Gold.
         THE COURT:
                    Who?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLD: Mark Gold.
         THE COURT: Your situation?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLD: I have been having stomach
problems.
```

1 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLD**: I have stomach problems. THE COURT: Are you contagious? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLD: I don't know. I have trouble 3 going to the bathroom. 4 5 THE COURT: Right now? I mean, currently? **PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLD:** Currently, yes. 6 7 THE COURT: I'm going to excuse Mr. Gold, unless I hear an objection. 8 9 MR. VAN NEST: No objection, Your Honor. MR. BICKS: No objection. 10 11 THE COURT: Go back to the jury assembly room and tell them what happened. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. Good luck. 14 Anyone else? The gentleman back there. You have to come 15 16 up here. I can't hear you back there. It's not going to be 17 that easy. You have to come all the way up here, stand in front of all these people, and tell me how sick you are. 18 First thing is what is your name? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR TYRRELL: I'm James Tyrrell. 20 THE COURT: Mr. Tyrrell, what is your situation? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR TYRRELL: I'm not ill, Your Honor, 22 23 but I'm having a difficult time hearing. I'm having trouble with my hearing. I haven't been able to get hearing aids yet 24 25 so I barely have understood any information.

THE COURT: Who in the front row would like to switch?

He is way back in the back. Who would raise their hand and sit back in his spot for a moment?

Thank you, sir. You go back there, and you go sit up there, Mr. Tyrrell. We will make sure you can hear okay.

Anyone else? Come on. Nobody else? Out of 71 people, that's great. See, you're so willing to serve that this is why I love juries. Only one person out of 71. Okay.

So next step, this is going to -- let me tell you how long this case will be. Probably it will go to June 10th. I don't think it will go any longer than June 10th and it probably will go a little less than June 10th. And all of you should have been cleared through that length of time already.

So whenever you get called forward, if you have some hardship issue, you've got to bring it up. But we will be in session every single day that's a holiday, except I'm going to probably give you off May 20, Friday May 20. And the other days we'll be in session. This week five days, next week four days, the following week five days, and so forth.

So that's the drill. And the jury -- the 10 members of the jury have to be here at 7:45 each morning. 7:45. And then they get to go home at 1:00. 1:00 p.m. 1:00 p.m. Except when they start to deliberate, then usually the juries decide they want to stay later in the day because often they can decide the case right away and not have to come back the next day. It's

up to them. They can stay as late as they want. Midnight if they want. We will always be here if they want to go to midnight. No one has done that yet, but they have gone to 7:00 p.m. So it's up to them.

So that's going to be our situation on the timing. You have to be here at 7:45 and you have to be -- why is that?

Some of you think well -- I bet you have never served on a jury. You think Oh, if I'm a little late, I can just look at somebody's notes, like high school. No. You have to be here to see and hear every single word said by every single witness for yourself. You can't rely on somebody else's notes.

So on those rare occasions when somebody is sick -- not sick. They're just late. We sit here counting the dots on the ceiling. Everybody in the jury box, we're just counting the dots on the ceiling in total stoney silence until you arrive, so you don't want to put us in that position. You've got to be here at 7:45.

Once you get selected, there is no such thing as to say oh, I forgot to tell you this. You've got to tell us beforehand because it's like the Army. If you get drafted, you're in for the duration. You don't get out. You can't say oh, I forgot to tell you this. Okay.

All right. Again, I want to thank all of you. This is such a -- it's wonderful that we have juries that will come in from all over the district and decide these cases and just --

it's wonderful.

So what is this case that we're talk about? Remember, I said this side of the room is Oracle America. I'm just going to call it Oracle. And over here is Google. These are large companies in America, and they are here with a disagreement and the jury will decide the disagreement. Not the judge; the jury.

And I have a very short statement here that I'm going to read to tell you what the case is about. Why am I doing this? Well, possibly once you hear the statement of the case, there will be something about your background that would cause you to be biased. For example, if you currently work for one of these companies, that's probably not good. We probably wouldn't be allowed to keep you on the jury. So here we go.

"The plaintiff in this case is Oracle America, Inc., formerly known as Sun Microsystems. And the defendant is Google, Inc."

Let me say that again so it will sink in.

"The plaintiff in this case is Oracle America, Inc., formerly known as Sun Microsystems. And the defendant is Google, Inc. This is a case involving claims of copyright infringement."

Copyright. Copyright infringement. That's what the case is about.

"In November 2007, Google announced a new operating system

called Android. " Android.

"November 2007, Google announced a new operating system called Android which has been used in devices such as smartphones and tablets. Android uses certain parts of a copyrighted software platform called Java SE."

You're going to find out that SE standards for *standard* edition. Right? Am I right about that?

MR. VAN NEST: Yes, you are, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So I'm going to repeat that sentence.

"Android uses certain parts of a copyrighted software platform called Java SE owned by Oracle."

It used to be owned by Sun Microsystems, but Sun Microsystems was acquired by Oracle America or by Oracle and now called Oracle America, Inc., so Java SE owned by Oracle.

"Oracle contends that Android's use of this material infringes Oracle's copyrights. Google contends that Android does not infringe these copyrights because its use is a, quote, fair use, close quote under the law."

Now later on I'll give you a definition of that term fair use. It is in the Copyright Act it's a thing called fair use and I'll have to explain that to you later.

So let me read this paragraph again.

"Oracle contends that Android's use of this material infringes Oracle's copyrights. Google contends that Android does not infringe these copyrights because its use is a fair

use under the law. Oracle also seeks billions, "billions, 1 that's with a B. "Oracle also seeks billions of dollars in 2 damages. Google denies that Oracle is entitled to any 3 damages." 4 5 That's what the case is about. Okay. So the issues that the jury will have to decide will be is 6 it a fair use. Okay? Number one. And number two, if it's not 7 a fair use, then what are the damages. And was it willful. 8 There may be a few other issues that the jury would have to 9 decide that I can't think of right now, but that's kind of what 10 11 the jury is going to have to be deciding for us. Okay. So did everyone here -- did you in the front row, 12 13 did you hear what I just said? PROSPECTIVE JUROR TYRRELL: I'm struggling a little 14 15 bit, but it's better, yes, thank you. 16 THE COURT: What we are going to do now is pass out -are my troops ready with the passing out thing? Where is that? 17 I don't even see it in here. 18 We have them in the back. 19 THE CLERK: THE COURT: They are going to wheel in some 20 21 questionnaires. It is a very short questionnaire, but we've 22 decided this will go faster if you answer a one-page 23 questionnaire, and we're going to give you 15 minutes to do that. So we'll give you specific instructions as we go along 24

here, but the first thing you've got to do is get your hands on

```
a questionnaire and a pencil and a clipboard so it will be easy
 1
     for you to write.
 2
          While they're getting organized, you will get one -- it's
 3
     a front and back of one page. It's not that many questions.
 4
 5
     But you've got to read each one to yourself and answer it
     truthfully. Remember that you are under oath. And then on the
 6
    back side, there are the possible witnesses in the case, and
 7
     you need to circle anybody that you think you know.
 8
          And it's just go to be easier if we all sit here, and
 9
     we'll give you 15 minutes of silence to answer the questions.
10
11
     And then when you finish answering the questions, just hold on
     to your copy of the clipboard and the questionnaire. Don't try
12
     to pass it down to the end. Just hold it in your lap.
13
          Raise your hand if you did not get a questionnaire.
14
          Somebody in the front row just left the courtroom.
15
                                                              What
16
     was going on there?
17
              MR. TOTH: He went to the restroom.
              THE COURT: Does he have a questionnaire?
18
              MR. TOTH:
19
                         Yes.
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. You have about 15 minutes.
20
     looks like everyone is staring up toward me, then we'll resume.
21
                      (Off the record at 8:54 a.m.)
22
                       (On the record at 9:02 a.m.)
23
              THE COURT: Anybody still working on the
24
     questionnaire, raise your hand. We will give you all the time
25
```

```
you need.
 1
                      (Off the record at 9:02 a.m.)
 2
                       (On the record at 9:03 a.m.)
 3
              THE COURT: How about now? Anyone still working on
 4
 5
          I still have one in the front row. Do you still need more
     time?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
                                       I'm done.
 7
              THE COURT: Anyone else still working on your
 8
     questionnaire? Please raise your hand. Okay. Please go
 9
     ahead.
             We'll wait.
10
                      (Off the record at 9:03 a.m.)
11
                       (On the record at 9:04 a.m.)
12
13
              THE COURT: Done? Anyone else still need time?
     looks like you're all done.
14
15
          Here's the thing. Just hold on to your questionnaire.
16
    Make sure you signed it at the bottom and put on the date.
17
     Today's date is May 9. Be sure you signed it at the bottom
     under penalty of perjury. And just hold it in your lap until
18
19
     we know if you're called forward or not, and then at that time,
20
     I will tell you what to do when you're called forward.
21
          So we're going to now turn to exactly that. The clerk
     will now call forward 16 of you.
22
23
          And, counsel, I just want to be clear. You see we have
     two additional seats to accommodate 16. Do you see that?
24
25
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             Yes.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
The Seat No. 1 is the temporary seat
         THE COURT:
nearest the court reporter, and then it goes across to No. 8
and then we start with 9. The temporary seat goes across to
16.
    Understand?
        MR. BICKS:
                    Yes.
        MR. VAN NEST: Understood.
         THE COURT: Let's start calling forward some of our
good people.
                    Cary Heil, H-E-I-L.
         THE CLERK:
         THE COURT: All right. Come forward. Don't call any
more names yet. I want to show everybody how the drill works.
     I'm sorry. See how crowded it is? It takes you --
naturally, the first person called would be at the very end;
right?
    All right. Welcome.
                          Come forward, if you would, to one
of these two podiums. And your name again?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HEIL: It's Cary Heil.
         THE COURT: May I see your questionnaire, please.
     So on number -- all right.
     Counsel, you have agreed, I believe, that -- here, counsel
let's make sure that we understand. Take a look at the back of
this form, and under your stipulation, I think I am supposed to
excuse Ms. Heil; correct?
         MR. VAN NEST: Acquainted with, Your Honor.
                    Yes. But look at the back. It was
         THE COURT:
```

```
Wasn't that your stipulation?
 1
     circled.
              MR. VAN NEST: It is, but acquainted with I think
 2
     should require just a question or two.
 3
              THE COURT: No. You all had a stipulation.
 4
 5
              MR. VAN NEST: I think acquainted means knows
 6
     personally.
              THE COURT: Wasn't the stipulation that if anyone
 7
     circled somebody on the back, that they were excused?
 8
              MR. VAN NEST: Right.
 9
              MR. BICKS: Yes.
10
11
              MR. VAN NEST: Subject to a question about whether
     it's the person that they're acquainted with.
12
                          I guess you did say that. All right.
13
              THE COURT:
          On the person -- do you know Mr. Ellison personally?
14
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HEIL: I know -- I worked for his
16
     personal accounting firm, and I know just about everything
     about him personally. I have never met him personally.
17
18
              THE COURT: All right.
          Isn't that good enough?
19
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             It is.
20
              MR. BICKS:
                          It is.
21
22
                          All right.
              THE COURT:
23
          Ms. Heil, please go back to the jury assembly room AND
     tell them what happened. You're excused.
24
                                                Thank you.
25
          Now, counsel, before I call the next person, on the other
```

```
protocol, which is go to the end of the line, it's on Questions
 1
     9D or E; correct?
 2
             MR. BICKS:
                         Yes.
 3
              THE COURT: Both of those?
 4
 5
             MR. BICKS: Yes.
             MR. VAN NEST: Yes, Your Honor.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: All right. Okay. Let's call the next
 8
    name.
 9
              THE CLERK:
                         Okay. Kelci Lowery, L-O-W-E-R-Y.
              THE COURT: All right. So please come stand at the
10
11
     lectern, Ms. Lowery. Is that your name?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY: Yes.
12
13
              THE COURT: How are you today?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY: Good.
14
                                                Thank you.
              THE COURT: Let's have your questionnaire.
15
16
              THE COURT: Okay. So congratulations. You get to sit
     in that first chair right over there, and just wait a few
17
18
     minutes and enjoy the show so to speak.
19
         Next name.
              THE CLERK: Diana Rocha, R-o-c-h-a.
20
              THE COURT:
                         Who's going to be after Ms. Rocha?
21
              THE CLERK: Judith Shattuck.
22
              THE COURT: Let's call her too.
23
              THE CLERK: Judith Shattuck. S-h-a-t-t-u-c-k.
24
25
              THE COURT: All right. While she's coming forward,
```

```
Ms. Rocha?
 1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: Rocha.
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
 3
          You did look at the names on the back; correct?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA:
                                        I did.
              THE COURT: You didn't circle anybody. All right.
 6
    Good for you.
 7
          Please take the second seat.
 8
          And now we get Ms. Shattuck. And we'll be calling another
 9
    name forward.
10
          Ms. Shattuck, if you will hand the clerk your
11
     questionnaire, please.
12
          You can take seat number three.
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Thank you.
14
15
              THE COURT: Can we please keep the names coming.
16
              THE CLERK: Okay. I have to write and do several
17
     things to keep up with you.
18
          Jacqueline McGrath. M-c-G-r-a-t-h.
              THE COURT: And then a second name.
19
20
              THE CLERK: Michael Wong. W-o-n-q.
21
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Wong, we've got to go to
    Ms. McGrath first.
22
          Welcome, Ms. McGrath. Let's have your questionnaire.
23
          Okay. You can sit in seat number 4.
24
```

And, Mr. Wong, you can have seat number 5.

```
THE CLERK:
                          Marion Jacobs. J-a-c-o-b-s.
 1
          And Patricia Sizemore, Sizemore.
 2
              THE COURT: All right. Ms. Jacobs, is that you?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: Yes, sir.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Welcome.
          Okay. Please have the next seat over there.
 6
 7
          And then, Ms. Sizemore, please have the next seat over
     there.
 8
         And?
 9
              THE CLERK: Bradley Peralta, P-e-r-a-l-t-a. And John
10
11
     Kotlar, K-o-t-l-a-r.
12
          Thank you.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR PERALTA: You're welcome.
13
              THE COURT: I need my law clerk to come start making
14
15
     some copies.
16
              THE CLERK: Angie will do it.
17
              THE COURT:
                         We need two copies; one for each side.
     And I'll just work with the original, all right.
18
          Okay. So you say -- I'm sorry, your name?
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR PERALTA: Bradley Peralta.
20
              THE COURT: Peralta. You circled a name on the back,
21
    Hiroshi Lockheimer.
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR PERALTA:
23
                                         Yes.
              THE COURT: And what do you -- what do you know about
24
25
     that person? Because it may be not the same person.
```

```
us their age, something about them.
 1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR PERALTA: I'm not sure what his age
 2
     is, but I went to college with his wife. And I'm friends with
 3
    his wife.
 4
              THE COURT: And how old would he be?
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR PERALTA: Maybe in the early 40s,
 6
 7
    possibly.
              THE COURT: Early 40s. Do you know where he might
 8
    work?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR PERALTA: He works at Google.
10
11
              THE COURT: He works at Google. All right. I think
    we've got to excuse him.
12
13
              MR. VAN NEST: Yes, Your Honor.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR PERALTA: Thank you.
14
              THE COURT: So, Mr. Peralta, you're excused. Please
15
16
     go to the jury assembly room and explain what happened.
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR PERALTA: All right.
              THE COURT: Okay. You're Mr. Kotlar?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Kotlar, yes, sir.
19
              THE COURT: All right. You get to take that last seat
20
     over there.
21
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Okay.
23
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
24
          And now we go to a new name.
25
              THE CLERK: Okay. Betsy Harper. H-a-r-p-e-r.
```

```
And Paul Roberds, R-o-b-e-r-d-s.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: All right. Ms. Harper.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR MS. HARPER: Yes.
 3
              THE COURT: Welcome. And, let's see. You may have
 4
 5
     that seat behind Ms. -- what's your name?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY: Kelci.
 6
              THE COURT: Kelci.
 7
          And now Mr. Roberds. Am I saying your name right?
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERDS: Roberds.
 9
              THE COURT: Okay. Please take the next seat.
10
11
              THE CLERK: Debra Riddle, R-i-d-d-l-e.
          Claudette Goldberg. G-o-l-d-b-e-r-g.
12
13
              THE COURT:
                          Good morning. Are you Ms. Riddle?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Yes.
14
15
              THE COURT: How are you today?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Fine. How are you?
16
17
              THE COURT: Excellent.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Uh-huh.
18
              THE COURT: All right. I can't tell which one -- did
19
     you say -- on number 9E, it looks like you marked it both ways.
20
    Which is your final answer?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: I'm not favorable.
22
23
     in the beginning because I was thinking of Google's products.
     I like Google products.
24
25
              THE COURT: But I can't tell which one you answered
```

```
On 9E it looks like you checked both boxes.
 1
     here.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: I meant to cross the top
 2
     one off. It should be "No."
 3
              THE COURT: It should be what?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: "No."
              THE COURT: It says "No, I have no strong opinion."
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Right.
 7
              THE COURT: So you have no strong opinion. All right.
 8
 9
     So you get to go have the next seat.
          Thank you.
10
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Thank you.
              THE COURT: Okay. Who's next?
12
13
              THE CLERK: She's right here. Ms. Goldberg.
              THE COURT: Okay. You get to have the next seat.
14
15
     Thank you.
16
         Okay. Two more names.
17
              THE CLERK: Give me just a second. Okay. Jeannie
18
     Settles, S-e-t-t-l-e-s. And Szymon Perkowski,
19
     P-e-r-k-o-w-s-k-i.
20
              THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Settles, is that the way you
21
     say it?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SETTLES: Yes.
22
              THE COURT: Please take the next seat over there.
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SETTLES: Thank you.
24
25
              THE COURT: So on account of the way you answered, you
```

```
do not get excused to the jury assembly room, but you do have
 1
     to go back and sit where you were for a moment.
 2
          We may or may not get to you, but there we are.
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR PERALTA: Thank you.
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                         Who's next?
              THE CLERK: Melanie Calonsag, C-a-l-o-n-s-a-g.
 6
 7
          And Ford Turping. T-u-r-p-i-n-g.
              THE COURT: So, Ms. Calonsag?
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR CALONSAG: Calonsag.
 9
              THE COURT: Calonsag?
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR CALONSAG:
11
              THE COURT: Please have the next seat over there.
12
          Do I have anyone here from the clerk's office to do some
13
     copying?
14
15
              THE CLERK: Angie just walked back in.
              MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, could you please say her
16
17
    name again. K or C?
18
              THE COURT: C.
19
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             Thank you.
20
              THE COURT: C-a-l-o-n-s-a-q.
21
              MR. VAN NEST: Thank you.
              THE COURT: So, Mr. Turping, you are in the same
22
23
     category. You get to go sit in the back, in your seat for a
24
     moment.
              We may or may not get to you.
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR TURPING: Okay.
```

```
THE COURT:
 1
                          Okay.
 2
              THE CLERK: Melissa Hines, H-i-n-e-s.
          And Michael Owens, O-w-e-n-s.
 3
              THE COURT:
                          So you are Melissa Hines. Welcome.
 4
 5
          All right. Ms. Hines, you get to go sit in the next seat
     over there.
 6
 7
          Mr. Owens?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR OWENS:
 8
                                       Yes.
              THE COURT:
 9
                         Welcome. So, Mr. Owen?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR OWENS: Owens.
10
              THE COURT:
11
                          Owens.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR OWENS: Yes.
12
              THE COURT: You didn't write the S on here.
13
     misspelled your own name.
14
15
          (Laughter)
16
              THE COURT: But doesn't matter. Right now you get to
17
     go sit in the back in your other seat. We might get to you.
18
     We might not.
19
          All right.
                      Next.
20
                         Okay. David Mangels, M-a-n-q-e-l-s.
              THE CLERK:
21
              THE COURT:
                         Where is Angie?
22
              THE CLERK: Right here. She's waiting for the last
23
     one.
                         Okay. Mr. Mangels.
24
              THE COURT:
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: Mangels.
```

THE COURT: You get to have that last seat.

Angie, please copy these. Same thing.

Now, the rest of you out there will probably be called -not all of you, but some of you will be called forward before
this is all over. So you need to continue to listen very
carefully to all of the questions. And so there we go.

Now, first order of business for you 16 is to ask you about hardship of serving on this case. In other words, let's just go over the drill again.

Who remembers what time it is you've got to be here in the morning?

PROSPECTIVE JURORS: 7:45.

THE COURT: 7:45.

Now, the lawyers will actually get here at 7:30. And I will meet with them at 7:30 so we can clear away any problems that might be pending so that at 7:45, or very close to it, we get you out here and start with the evidence.

And then that may seem like it's early in the morning, but then you get to go home at 1:00. We don't even have a lunch break. We just have convenience breaks during the morning.

And at 1:00 o'clock you get to leave. So the traffic is a lot better at 1:00 o'clock. A lot of advantages to this schedule.

But every now and then somebody has a hardship meeting this schedule. So I need to listen to what your hardship issue is if you have one. Maybe you don't. I don't know.

So do we have the microphone ready to go? 1 2 THE CLERK: Yes. Raise your hand if it would be a hardship THE COURT: 3 to serve on this case. Remember you could be here as late as 4 5 June 10. I think it will be done a little sooner than that, but we can't be sure. And you need to be clear the decks all 6 7 the way through June 10. So raise your hand if you want to ask for hardship. 8 Okay. Ms. -- don't tell me. Ms. Lowery. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY: Yes. 10 11 THE COURT: We need to give you the microphone. Okay. What's your issue? 12 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY: Uhm, I do not have a car. And I live about 45 minutes away. So the commute would be me 14 15 having to take the bus, and it would be very difficult. 16 I'm also currently enrolled in summer semester classes through the Santa Rosa Junior College. And my current semester 17 that I'm in now would continue, I think, through the beginning 18 of the trial. 19 THE COURT: You mean you're taking classes now? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY: 21 Yes. Are you missing classes today? 22 THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY: No. 23 THE COURT: What time of day are your classes? 24 25 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY:** My class is 10:30 to noon,

```
Tuesdays through Thursdays.
 1
              THE COURT:
                          That's an automatic excuse there.
 2
          How come you didn't say this on your form? We tried to
 3
 4
     free clear everyone.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY: I did say it.
 5
                         Then I goofed up.
              THE COURT:
 6
           (Laughter)
 7
              THE COURT: That's the first time in a long time.
 8
           (Laughter)
 9
              THE COURT: All right. I'm going to excuse
10
11
     Ms. Lowery. She has to go to her classes. We can't keep her
     here.
12
13
          Any objection?
              MR. BICKS: No, Your Honor.
14
15
              MR. VAN NEST: No, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right, Ms. Lowery. Good luck.
16
                                                               Make
17
     A's for me.
18
           (Laughter)
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR LOWERY:
                                         Thank you.
19
20
              THE COURT:
                         Thank you. Before we move on, we need to
21
     replace Ms. Lowery.
          Anybody else over there a student? It's an automatic out
22
     if you would miss classes.
23
24
          Okay.
              THE CLERK: Rune Stromsness S-t-r-o-m-s-n-e-s-s.
25
```

THE COURT: 1 Okay. You get to have seat number 1. All right. Again, I ask the question, did you hear the 2 hardship thing? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Yes. 4 5 THE COURT: Do you know the schedule? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Yes. 6 7 THE COURT: Do you have any hardship issue you want to bring up? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: No. 9 THE COURT: Anyone else? 10 11 We go to Ms. McGrath. You need to use the microphone, 12 please. PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: I don't want to miss my 13 daughter's graduation on Tuesday from the credential program at 14 15 Sonoma State. 16 THE COURT: This coming Tuesday? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: Yes. THE COURT: What time of day would that be? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: It's in the afternoon. 19 20 THE COURT: What time? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: I think it's at 2 o'clock. And the other thing is, I work full-time as a nurse at 22 23 Kaiser, in the cardiology clinic, as a heart failure care monitor. And that's a nursing job and an extended role. 24 25 there's no one trained to replace me when I'm off.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
That one I cannot give you. Kaiser is a
         THE COURT:
big company. They can figure it out. Under the law, that's a
hardship to the company, not to you. So that one I can't do.
    But I'm more sympathetic to, your daughter is about to
graduate?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: Uh-huh.
         THE COURT: How early -- are you sure it's 2 o'clock?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: Yes.
         THE COURT: So let's say it's 2 o'clock. How early
would we need to adjourn that day for you to make it up to the
graduation?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: Well, I live in Napa.
I would normally be taking BART back to Martinez. So I would
drive from Martinez. I should get my husband first.
      (Laughter)
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: And then drive to Sonoma.
I don't know how long. A few hours.
         THE COURT: Is that the only issue you have for this
whole time period?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: Yes.
         THE COURT: Here's what we'll do. If you get selected
to serve, we will end early enough that day that you can make
the graduation.
     Is that okay?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: All right.
```

THE COURT: All right. So you'll just have to tell me what you need. And I'll rely on it in good faith. And we'll have a shorter day that day. We'll figure out how to make it up in some other way. But we're going to end at 1:00 o'clock every day, so all right.

Anyone else? Down there. Ms -- how do you say your name?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SIZEMORE: Sizemore.

THE COURT: Sizemore.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SIZEMORE: I don't know if you call this a hardship, but I'm a single person. And I have a Great Dane that just turned 11 years old. And he's very sick. He's not eating. I'm afraid he's going to pass in the next couple of weeks. I will be an emotional wreck. I just wanted you to know that. If I'm sitting here crying during the trial, you'll know why.

THE COURT: What kind of dog is this?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SIZEMORE: He's a Great Dane. And it's very rare for them to be 11 years old. He's like my kid. I know it's not a kid, but I still a feel like that.

THE COURT: So is there anyone there taking care of the dog now?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SIZEMORE: No. He stays at home.

But he's not doing well. He's gone from 115 to 93 pounds. And

I have to give him stimulants to make him eat stuff.

THE COURT: Are you going to be worrying about this

```
the whole time?
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SIZEMORE: Pretty much, yeah.
              THE COURT: I'm going to excuse Ms. Sizemore unless I
 3
     hear an objection.
 4
 5
              MR. VAN NEST: No objection.
              MR. BICKS:
                          No.
 6
 7
              THE COURT:
                         Good luck with your pet.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SIZEMORE: Thank you very much.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: I hope the last days with your pet are
     good ones.
10
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SIZEMORE:
                                           Thank you.
              THE COURT: All right. Please go back to the jury
12
13
     assembly room.
          Anyone else have a hardship issue? Nobody is raising
14
15
     their hand.
16
          Dawn, we need to call forwards somebody else.
              THE CLERK: Okay, Judge. Ronald Haley, H-a-l-e-y.
17
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. You get to take the empty seat,
18
19
     Mr. Haley.
          Mr. Haley. Do you have any hardship issue?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY:
21
                                       No.
              THE COURT: Again, I need to ask, anyone of the 16 of
22
23
     you have a hardship issue?
24
          Okay. In the back row, Mr. Mangels.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: Question is right now I
25
```

have to pee. 1 2 THE COURT: What? **PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS:** I have a weak bladder. 3 THE COURT: Do you have to go right now? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: Yeah. The question is, 6 how close are the breaks put together? They can be -- they usually run an hour 7 THE COURT: and a half to an hour and 45 minutes apart. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: Okay. That's fine. 9 THE COURT: Can you make it that long? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: 11 Yeah. THE COURT: All right. Do you need to go right now? 12 13 The thing is, I've got to take a break for everyone. you last about another -- do you have to go right now? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: I can hold off. 15 16 THE COURT: All right. You hold off. 17 Anyone else? 18 Anyone over there have difficulty with the English 19 language? This is going to involve a lot of documents and the 20 English language. If you have difficulty with English, you 21 really ought to raise your hand now. 22 Nobody is raising their hand. Good. Okay. 23 Okay. All right. What we're going to do now is start getting some basic biographical information on you. And then 24 25 we will probably take a break in -- not go through all of you

1 yet. Who's got the microphone? Please hand it over to 2 Mr. Stromsness. 3 Mr. Stromsness, can you see that chart, that poster board? 4 5 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS:** Pretty much. get to the bottom one I will stand up. 6 7 THE COURT: Go down it and give good, accurate information on each point. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: My name is Rune 9 Stromsness. I live in Oakland, California. 10 I have a 11 bachelor's of science degree in electrical engineering and computer science from the University of California at Berkeley. 12 13 I currently work for the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab as a network and telephone manager. 14 15 I'm not sure exactly what you want for number 5. People I 16 donate money to, 40 or 50 or groups I'm actually active with. 17 THE COURT: Err on the side of telling us more than less. 18 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS:** Okay. The only group 19 20 that I'm currently active with is the North American Network 21 Operators Group. North American what? 22 THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: North American Network 23 Operators Group. People who run systems on the Internet. 24 25 I attend their meetings two or three times a year and pay

3

6

membership dues to them. 1 I have in the past been active in alumni associations of UC Berkeley. And then I give money to 40 or 50 different Environmental causes. Gay rights causes. I believe 4 5 that I have in the last couple of years given money to the EFF. Just vaguely, I'm not sure I remember what all the causes I donate to are. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Hobbies, I like 9 walking, hiking, traveling, reading. 10 11 I am single but with a partner of seven years. My partner is a network engineer, also at Lawrence Berkeley National 12 13 Laboratory. I have no children. 14 I've never been on a jury before. Although I've been at 15 16 this stage once or twice in Superior Court. 17 I've never been in the military or law enforcement. And I've never actually made it to be in a court. 18 19 Although, I was interviewed by a district attorney once. 20 there was a plea deal. I never showed up in court. Okay. Angie, whatever happened to the 21 THE COURT: 22 originals? 23 THE CLERK: I have them. THE COURT: You've got the originals. 24 25 All right. So Mr. Stromsness -- am I saying your name

right? 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Stromsness. 2 THE COURT: You work in an area where you probably 3 know something about the subject matter we're dealing with. 4 5 Would that be a fair statement? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I probably know 6 7 something about it, yes, as a student 20-some years ago. THE COURT: It doesn't matter. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Okay. 9 THE COURT: You can still be a juror on the case. 10 11 But you and your partner both work in this computer science area; true? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Correct. 13 THE COURT: So if you get selected to serve, you 14 15 cannot talk to your partner, when you go home at night, about 16 what the evidence was or about the arguments they're making. 17 Because then pretty soon he would be talking to you; right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: 18 Do you understand that? 19 THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I do. 20 THE COURT: Are you going to have any trouble 21 following that? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: 23 No. THE COURT: All right. Please pass the microphone 24 over to Ms. Rocha. 25

```
Hi.
 1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA:
                                             My name is Diana Rocha.
     I live in Concord, California.
 2
          I have some college.
 3
          I work as a transitional employment coordinator for
 4
 5
     Goodwill Industries. And I'm not affiliated with any
     organizations or clubs.
 6
          My hobbies are hiking, kayaking, and going to the beach.
 7
          And I'm divorced.
 8
          And I have three children. They are 31, 28, and 24.
 9
     oldest works in finance. My middle child is a manager at Mac
10
11
     Makeup. And my youngest is a manager at Panera Bread.
          I have never had any prior jury service.
12
          I've never been in the military or law enforcement.
13
          And I've never been a party or a witness in court.
14
15
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                 Thank you.
16
          Next.
                 Ms. Shattuck.
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: My name is Judy Shattuck.
     I live in Berkeley.
18
          My education stopped somewhere around being a sophomore in
19
     college.
20
          I worked at the University of California as a clerical
21
     employee for, I don't know, about 40 years.
22
23
          I was active in my union.
          I don't think -- well, somebody mentioned organizations to
24
     which they contribute. And I do contribute to about 40
25
```

```
organizations.
 1
          Hobbies, I do ceramics.
 2
          I'm divorced. My -- I was divorced from a mathematician.
 3
          I have one child, who is 40. And he does something about
 4
 5
     computers. I really don't understand them.
          Which reminds me that I wanted to say I don't have any
 6
     trouble with English. But in my limited experience with
 7
     computers, I find that English is used in strange and unnatural
 8
 9
     ways.
10
          (Laughter.)
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: By computer people.
11
     I don't understand the second meaning that -- what computer
12
     people mean by what I thought was, you know, simple words.
13
          I've never been on a jury.
14
15
          I have not been in the military or law enforcement.
16
          And I've never been a party or witness in court.
17
              THE COURT:
                         Wonderful.
                                      Thank you.
18
          Ms. McGrath.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: My name is Jackie McGrath.
19
20
     I live in Napa, California.
21
          I have an associate degree. I'm a registered nurse at
     Kaiser.
22
          I'm a member of the California Nurses Association and a
23
     couple of medical organizations.
24
25
          I like gardening, hiking.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Married.
              My husband has an auto repair business in Napa.
     We have five children, adults. One is an auto repair
technician. One is a dental hygienist. One is a nurse.
is graduating to be a teacher. And the other one is a pharmacy
technician.
     I was on a jury in my 20s. And I barely remember anything
about it. Although, it was a guilty verdict.
     I've never been in the military or law enforcement.
     And I've never been a witness in court or in any court
proceeding myself.
         THE COURT:
                     Thank you.
     Mr. Wong.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR WONG: My name is Michael Wong.
live in San Francisco. I've had some college education.
     I work at UCSF Medical Center.
         THE COURT: Closer to the microphone, please.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR WONG: I work at UCSF Medical Center
as maintenance.
     Organizations, Chinese American Citizens Alliance.
                                                         But I
go for the activities.
     Hobbies, electronics, some sports.
     Single. No spouse. No kids.
     I've never been on a jury duty, jury service.
     I have no military or law enforcement background.
     And I was a character witness about 30 years ago.
```

```
friend of mine just was accused of shoplifting.
 1
                         Okay. What do you like about electronics?
 2
              THE COURT:
     What do you -- what's your thing there?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WONG: I like to just tinker with
 4
 5
     everything that comes out on the market.
 6
              THE COURT: Like what? Give us an example.
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WONG: Photography, video, audio.
     Computers as well.
 8
              THE COURT:
 9
                          Thank you.
          Next we go to Ms. Jacobs.
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: Hi. My name is Marion
11
     Jacobs. I live in Concord, California.
12
          I have a bachelor's of science in nursing. I am an R.N.
13
     in the emergency department for John Muir.
14
15
          I am involved with ENA, Emergency Nurses Association.
16
    Also, I'm an active member of nursing union.
17
          Hobbies, I like to garden. I have a 1-year-old so there's
    not much time for hobbies.
18
           (Laughter)
19
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: I am married. My husband
20
     is a retired deputy sheriff for Contra Costa County. But he's
21
     a stay-at-home father now.
22
          We have a 13-month-old. He does not work.
23
24
           (Laughter)
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: I have not been on a jury.
25
```

```
Like I said, my husband is retired law enforcement.
 1
          And I have never been part of a witness or party of a
 2
     court case.
 3
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
 4
 5
          Mr. Haley.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Hi. My name is Ron Haley.
 6
     I live in Portola Valley.
 7
          My education is I have an MBA from UC Berkeley.
 8
 9
          I'm currently retired. Previously, I was a CFO for an
10
     aerospace company.
11
              THE COURT:
                         What kind of company?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Aerospace company.
13
              THE COURT: Do you mind telling us which one?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Sure.
                                               Space Systems Loral.
15
     They make communication satellites. Mostly commercial venture.
16
     A little bit of government.
17
              THE COURT: And you were the CFO?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: I was the CFO, correct.
18
19
              THE COURT:
                          All right.
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: No organizations or clubs to
21
     speak of.
          Hobbies are hiking and other activities.
22
23
          I am married. My spouse is retired also. She was a
     stay-at-home spouse for most of our relationship together.
24
25
     Worked briefly as a product line manager for Bechta (phonetic)
```

```
Machines, which is a biomedical firm.
 1
          Children two. 31 and 29. My oldest is just getting out
 2
     of school with an MBA. Graduates this spring. And my daughter
 3
     works with a software company in marketing.
 4
          I have been on a prior jury. We did not reach a verdict.
 5
     It was a plea bargained before we got it, about three days into
 6
     the court. It was a criminal action.
 7
          Never been in the military. And I have been a witness in
 8
     court as part of my job responsibilities in a wrongful
 9
     discharge suit.
10
11
              THE COURT: When you were working for the satellite
12
     company?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: That's right.
13
              THE COURT: Thank you.
14
15
          Next, Mr. Kotlar.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Yes, John Kotlar. City of
16
17
     residence Oakland.
          Finished a bachelor's of arts in Biblical studies at
18
19
    Marionette Baptist Bible College.
20
          Most recently got hired by East Bay MUD. Member of
    Heritage Baptist Church. And, unfortunately, a member of the
21
     union at 444 AFSCME.
22
23
          Gave you my work.
          Hobbies are trees, movies, TV, coin collecting.
24
```

like that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Married to my wife of almost 19 years.
                                            She's a teacher at
California Crosspoint High School.
    No children, unfortunately.
     Prior jury service, recently, about a month ago, say, in
Oakland. Every time I go to Oakland on a jury I get selected.
I was an alternate. They were supposed to tell me their
verdict, but I didn't hear it.
     But two decades ago at Oakland, also, I served on a jury.
And we reached a verdict. It was a preliminary trial. Both
were civil. And we were supposed to find for some guy who had
mesothelioma, which you hear a lot about now. So then it
wasn't a big thing back then. But we found he should get some
money. But it was only a preliminary hearing.
    No military service. Although, I wanted to join the
Marines.
    Never been a witness.
         THE COURT: What do you do for East Bay MUD?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Janitorial.
         THE COURT:
                    Thank you.
     Let's go back. Mr. Mangels -- okay. Angie is doing it.
We'll take over with Ms. Harper. Thank you.
     Ms. Harper, your turn. Can you see the chart?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Yes. My name is Betsey
        I live in Petaluma.
Harper.
     I possess a 2-year degree in human resources. And I'm
```

```
working on a four year business degree.
 1
          I work as an employment and training counselor for the
 2
     County of Sonoma.
 3
          I belong to a union with the County. In the past I've
 4
 5
     been involved with Girl Scouts, Project Grad, and other
     children-related organizations.
 6
          Hobbies include gardening, traveling, motorcycle riding.
 7
          I am married. My husband is a salesman and business
 8
     manager for a family-owned company in Petaluma.
 9
          We have two children, 23 and 27. One of them works in
10
     retail. And one of them works in childcare.
11
          I have never been selected to participate in a jury.
12
          I have no previous military or law enforcement experience.
13
          And I've been in court speaking only for myself for
14
15
     custody issues and things of that nature.
16
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
17
          Mr. Roberds.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERDS: Hi. My name Paul Roberds.
18
     I'm from Concord, California.
19
          Education, electrical education. I work for Performance
20
21
     Electric.
          And no organizations. Hobbies, motorcycles and music.
22
23
          I'm single. Have no children.
          No prior jury service.
24
25
          Never been in the military.
```

```
And never been a party or witness in court.
 1
              THE COURT: And do you -- are you an electrician?
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERDS: Yes. I'm electrician.
 3
     But right now I'm -- I'm not working, so.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
          Now we go to Ms. Riddle.
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: I can't see the board.
 7
              THE COURT: Can we bring it up a little closer to you?
 8
     I'll tell you what, I'll call out the questions. How's that?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Okay.
10
11
              THE COURT: First one:
                                      Name.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Debra Riddle.
12
              THE COURT: City of residence.
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Union City.
14
15
              THE COURT: Education.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Two years in college.
              THE COURT: Did you have a major?
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Psychology.
18
                         Okay. Most recent employer or job.
19
              THE COURT:
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: I work at El Camino
21
    Hospital.
22
              THE COURT: Where?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: El Camino Hospital, as a
23
    help desk technician.
24
              THE COURT: Are you doing that now?
25
```

```
1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: IT, yes.
              THE COURT: What organizations, clubs, unions, et
 2
     cetera, are you --
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: I'm not in any.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Not in any.
         Okay. How about a union. Are you in the union?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: No.
 7
              THE COURT: Hobbies?
 8
             PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Dancing, reading, movies.
 9
     That's about it.
10
11
              THE COURT: Okay. Marital -- what does that say?
    Marital status.
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Single.
13
              THE COURT: What?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: Single. No children.
15
16
              THE COURT: Okay. Spouse. Do you have any children?
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE:
                                        No.
              THE COURT: All right. Prior jury service.
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: I got as far as this, the
19
     jury selection. And I was excused.
20
21
              THE COURT: Okay. Ever served in the military or law
     enforcement?
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE: No.
23
              THE COURT: Ever been a party or a witness in court?
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR RIDDLE:
25
```

1 THE COURT: Okay. That's it. Thank you. 2 Now, we go to Ms. Goldberg. Can you see that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLDBERG: Yes, thank you. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Van Nest, would you rotate the thing 4 5 about 30 degrees so everyone over there can see it. Thank you. 6 MR. VAN NEST: Is that better? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLDBERG: Thank you. 8 My name is Claudette Goldberg. I live here in 9 San Francisco. 10 11 I have a master's in environmental management. I'm currently employed at Climate Works Foundation as a 12 coordinator in funder collaborations. 13 No organization/affiliation at the moment. 14 15 Hobbies, I swim when I get a chance. 16 I'm married. My husband is retired and does different 17 things. Most relevant to this case is he represents technologists. And he had a patent awarded a couple of months 18 ago. And he'll be taking it to market in a few more months. 19 And these are several potential buyers in this room. 20 THE COURT: I didn't understand that part. Is your 21 husband a lawyer? 22 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLDBERG: He is not a lawyer, but he -- we have a lawyer. He is a patent holder. And he will be 24 25 selling the patent, the rights to use the patent.

```
Are you saying he will be approaching one
 1
              THE COURT:
     of these companies --
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLDBERG:
 3
              THE COURT: -- to buy his patent?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLDBERG: Correct.
              THE COURT: While this trial is going on?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLDBERG: Quite possible. As soon
 7
     as possible would be great. It is possible there would be
 8
 9
     overlap.
          I think relating to question 9D, I would like all those
10
11
     six people to really like me. So this is a little concerning
     for me to be here.
12
              THE COURT: Well, I don't know. I guess this is going
13
     to sabotage that patent thing.
14
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLDBERG: I hope -- let's see.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. Keep going.
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLDBERG: Prior jury service, none.
18
     Never got past this point.
19
          No military or law enforcement experience.
20
          And no party or witness in court.
21
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
          Ms. Settles.
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SETTLES: Thank you. My name is
23
     Jeannie Settles. I live in San Carlos, on the peninsula.
24
25
          I have some college.
```

```
I work for San Mateo County as a telephone operator.
 1
          I am involved in the union.
 2
          My hobbies, hiking, cooking.
 3
          I am married. My husband has his own business, appliance
 4
 5
     repair.
          We have four children. Do you want their occupations?
 6
              THE COURT: Occupations.
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SETTLES: Electrician.
                                                        My second
 8
     works at the glass store in Marin County. My daughter is at
 9
     some college in Squaw Valley. And my son is at San Francisco
10
     State.
11
              THE COURT:
12
                          Okay.
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SETTLES: No jury duty.
          My husband did serve in the military six years, with the
14
15
     U.S. Navy.
16
          And I've never been a witness in court.
17
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you. Ms. Calonsag.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR CALONSAG: Hi. My name is Melanie
18
19
                I live in Daly City, California.
     Calonsaq.
20
          I have a bachelor's degree in finance. I'm an accountant
21
     for KaMMCO Mutual Insurance Company.
22
          I'm not involved in any organizations.
23
          My hobbies are traveling and photography.
          I am married. My spouse is -- he works in business
24
25
     development for a high-tech startup.
```

```
I have no children.
 1
          No prior jury service.
 2
          Never been in the military.
 3
          And never a party or witness in court.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: So what's the name of the high-tech
 6
     startup?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR CALONSAG:
 7
                                            Sherline Systems
     (phonetic) in San Jose.
 8
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 9
          Go to Ms. Hines.
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: Hi. I'm Melissa Hines.
11
                                                                   I'm
     from Clayton, California.
12
          I have a marketing degree from St. Mary's College in
13
     Moraga.
14
15
          I currently work for PG&E as their product manager.
16
     involved in a few of the employee resource groups at PG&E.
17
          I like to travel and do Yoga.
          Single.
18
          No children.
19
20
          No prior jury service.
21
          I've never been in the military, law enforcement.
          Nor have I been a party or witness in court.
22
23
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
24
          Mr. Mangels.
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: Dave Mangels. Livermore.
```

High School with some college classes. 1 Retired 2005 from Oakland International Flight Service 2 Station. 3 No organizations. 4 5 Gardening. Married. Wife secretary. 6 No children. 7 Services, as far as jury is, DWI and a lawsuit about a 8 malpractice with a doctor. 9 10 And, let's see. Military four years. 11 And was a witness in the Sinatra plane crash accident. THE COURT: Say that again. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: A witness for the Frank 13 Sinatra's mother's plane accident in Palm Springs back in the 14 15 '70s. 16 THE COURT: You were an eyewitness to that? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: I was a witness. THE COURT: Really? Okay. 18 19 So you --20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: That's because the pilot 21 filed his flight plan through the FAA. That's where the witness thing came in. 22 THE COURT: You said that you were on a jury before. 23 But did those juries -- don't tell me what the verdicts were, 24 25 but did you reach a verdict?

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: Oh, yeah.
 1
                                                     Yes.
                                                            Yes.
     Both the municipal and a superior.
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
 3
          Now, here's the deal: We're going to take a break.
 4
     need to remind you of that important -- really, I have to say,
 5
     direct order, no research about the case. No talking with each
 6
     other about the case or with anyone else about the case.
 7
          You can talk about sports. I don't even recommend
 8
 9
    politics.
          (Laughter)
10
11
              THE COURT: You don't even want to go there.
     stick with safe topics, weather, sports, traffic. And we'll
12
13
     take a 20-minute break. And then we'll resume right at that
14
     spot.
15
          And, now, all of you in the back of the room, we will need
16
     some of you yet, most likely. So you've got to come back too.
17
    And then we'll just pick it up from there.
          You should take your purses and belongings with you just
18
              But remember where you're seated so that we can get
19
     in case.
     you back in the same order.
20
          And we can't start until you're all here. So if one of
21
     you is late, then we just have to sit here. So please be on
22
23
     time.
          We'll take a 20-minute break.
24
                                         Thank you.
25
              THE CLERK: All rise.
```

```
You need to take your questionnaire with
 1
              THE COURT:
     you or leave it on the bench.
 2
          (Venire exits courtroom.)
 3
              THE COURT: All right. Everyone be seated.
 4
 5
          Is there anyone still in the courtroom who is a
     prospective juror? If so, raise your hand. Everyone is gone.
 6
          First item of business, for the three of the venire who I
 7
     returned back to their seats, I'm going to hand down to you the
 8
     questionnaires so you can come look at them now and make sure I
 9
     did it right.
10
11
          I want you to take a look and see if I did it right.
     think I did. They had answered that they had a strong view one
12
     way or the other on the question number 9.
13
          (Counsel review questionnaires.)
14
              THE COURT: And they had not circled anybody on the
15
16
     reverse side.
17
              MR. BICKS:
                         Looks right.
              MR. VAN NEST: I think so, Your Honor.
18
                         Okay.
                                 So hand those back to me.
19
              THE COURT:
          Given how many we have in the courtroom and what our hit
20
     ratio is, I feel that we could excuse these now.
21
22
          You didn't want to -- because it's very unlikely we're
23
     going to get to them. They're going to be at the very end.
     But I will continue with our protocol as we agreed on it.
24
25
              MR. VAN NEST: I would just as soon hold on for now,
```

Your Honor. 1 THE COURT: All right. We'll hold on to them. 2 Then I feel that Ms. Goldberg is going to have her 3 husband go to one of you two companies and try to sell her 4 5 patent. 6 (Laughter) THE COURT: And I feel that that's a problem. And I 7 don't want that even in the mix. It could just be a gimmick to 8 get out of jury service. I don't know. But I think we should 9 excuse her. I want to get your views. 10 11 MR. VAN NEST: I agree, Your Honor. MR. BICKS: Your Honor, I think we might benefit from 12 hearing a little bit more about it. Not a copyright and --13 THE COURT: Look. You just want somebody who likes 14 15 That's it. That's all you want. And you're going to IP. 16 waste our time while Mr. Van Nest shows that she's biased. 17 I'm going to leave her on for now, but I can see right through what you're doing. 18 I couldn't tell the -- how real --19 MR. BICKS: THE COURT: She says her husband wants to sell patents 20 21 to your company, and she wants Mr. Ellison to love her. 22 (Laughter) 23 THE COURT: Right? She said --24 MR. BICKS: 25 MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, she did say, even

unsolicited, there are a couple of buyers in the room. 1 I mean, it was --2 THE COURT: Couple of what? 3 MR. VAN NEST: Buyers, potential buyers. 4 5 THE COURT: That's what she said? That's what --MR. VAN NEST: 6 7 MR. BICKS: Your Honor, I didn't hear the "buyers in the room" comment. But that makes sense to let her qo. 8 THE COURT: Didn't she say that? 9 Did anyone else over there -- she said that the two 10 11 companies that are represented here were potential buyers of her husband's patent; right? 12 MR. VAN NEST: Yes. 13 14 MR. BICKS: Yeah. 15 THE COURT: Do you agree that I can excuse her? 16 MR. BICKS: Yes. 17 THE COURT: All right. She's gone. Okay. How about Ms. McGrath? Ms. McGrath is a different 18 19 situation. 20 She's the nurse who wants to attend her -- the only issue 21 there is whether or not -- we may have to give up two hours of 22 testimony that day in order to keep her. 23 I'm willing to do that because she seems like a good person. But if you both stipulated, I would excuse her. But I 24 25 feel like ordinarily I couldn't do that. I think we can

```
accommodate that one conflict.
 1
 2
              MR. BICKS:
                          I agree.
              MR. VAN NEST: Also, Your Honor.
 3
              THE COURT: All right. So we will excuse her; agreed?
 4
 5
              MR. VAN NEST: Yes, sir.
 6
              THE COURT: All right. So those two. Is there anyone
     else you want to discuss?
 7
              MR. BICKS: I was going to raise Ms. Riddle, Your
 8
 9
    Honor.
10
              THE COURT:
                         All right.
11
              MR. BICKS:
                         On her questionnaire she was the one who,
     I think, stood up and made comments she was very fond of
12
     Google. And then I see on the questionnaire I think it says
13
     "Adorable" about Google. "Favorable." And then it says, "Yes,
14
15
     I have a strong opinion." And then it was crossed out.
              THE COURT: Well, under our protocol I have to go the
16
17
    way I did.
18
          But what do you say over there? What she wrote -- she
19
     wrote down "Favorable" about Google, but then she scratched
20
     that out. At first she said, "Yes, I have a strong opinion
21
     about Google." She scratched that out and said, "No, I have no
22
     strong opinion."
23
              MR. BICKS: And next, Your Honor, she said she likes
     Google's products.
24
25
              THE COURT:
                         Yeah.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, she also said, maybe more
important than this, she can't see well. She couldn't even see
this board. So I'm fine letting her go.
         THE COURT: You're fine letting her go. Is that what
you both want to do?
        MR. BICKS:
                    Sure.
        MR. VAN NEST: Yes.
        THE COURT: Let me hear it.
        MR. BICKS:
                    Yes.
         THE COURT: So Ms. Riddle is gone.
    Anybody else you want to talk about?
                   Not here, Your Honor.
        MR. BICKS:
                    All right. So what I'm going to do now is
        THE COURT:
replace them in the order of -- I'll just excuse all three and
then replace them in their seated order.
    McGrath, Riddle, Goldberg. Agreed?
        MR. VAN NEST: Agreed. By their seat order, you mean
1, 2, 3?
        THE COURT:
                   McGrath would be first. She has the
lowest seat. Riddle next. Then Goldberg next.
        MR. VAN NEST: That's fine.
                   Does Oracle agree on that?
         THE COURT:
                    On Ms. McGrath, I said I was fine with her
        MR. BICKS:
staying, as Your Honor indicated.
         THE COURT:
                    I misunderstood. Are you fine with me
```

```
excusing her?
 1
              MR. BICKS: I thought we're fine with her staying.
 2
              THE COURT:
                         Are you fine with excusing her?
 3
          I mean, in other words, I proposed to excuse her because I
 4
 5
     think we might need that two hours of time. Now, if you say
 6
    no, you object --
 7
              MR. BICKS:
                         I don't object.
              THE COURT:
                         What?
 8
                         I do not object. If you wanted to keep
              MR. BICKS:
 9
     her, I said I was fine with that.
10
11
              THE COURT:
                          I would prefer to -- I think it's a close
            It's a close call. I think, though, that we're better
12
     call.
13
     off getting somebody who going in we know we don't have to --
     we don't have to cut two hours out of what might be a tight
14
15
     schedule.
          But I'm thinking about it. That's the way I would like to
16
17
     go, is to excuse her.
              MR. VAN NEST: No objection.
18
              MR. BICKS:
                          That's fine, Your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: All right. We're going to excuse all
20
             I'm going to replace them in the orders of McGrath,
21
     three.
     Riddle, Goldberg, which is their seat order.
22
23
          Any other people you want to bring up and discuss?
              MR. VAN NEST: Not here, Your Honor.
24
25
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. Well I'm not guite to the point
```

```
where I'm going to have -- you're going to get your question,
 1
     but in the next -- you will get to ask some questions.
 2
          You get to go first; right?
 3
              MR. BICKS:
                          Yes.
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. So, all right.
          On the two that we excused because they circled a name on
 6
 7
     the back, one was the woman who does Larry Ellison's
     accounting.
 8
 9
           (Laughter)
              THE COURT: And the other was the guy who knows
10
11
     Hiroshi Lockheimer. So those two, if you want to see them,
     I'll leave them up here. And Dawn can show them to you.
12
13
                 We're going to take about an 11- or 12-minute break
     ourselves and then resume.
14
15
              MR. BICKS: Thank you.
16
           (Recess taken from 10:06 to 11:17 a.m.)
17
              THE COURT: Be seated, please. No need to get up.
18
     Thank you.
          All right. We -- Ms. McGrath, we don't want you to miss
19
     out on your graduation. We could end early, but then that
20
21
     presents a problem for us. We're going to excuse you unless
22
     you want to -- no. Just go ahead.
23
           (Laughter)
              THE COURT: It's important for you to take off.
24
                                                                Tell
25
     the jury assembly room what happened.
```

```
1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCGRATH: Thank you.
                          Okay. Ms. Riddle, you get to be excused,
 2
              THE COURT:
     too, because you're having trouble reading the poster board.
 3
 4
     And you have to read a lot of stuff in this case. You're
     excused as well.
 5
          Ms. Goldberg, you're excused on account of you're trying
 6
     to sell products to both sides here.
 7
           (Laughter)
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR GOLDBERG: Thank you.
 9
              THE COURT: Now, the clerk will call the name and
10
11
     replace Mrs. McGrath.
              THE CLERK: Sean McKnew, M-c-K-n-e-w.
12
              THE COURT: Please take the front-row seat.
13
              THE CLERK: We need his questionnaire first, Your
14
15
     Honor.
16
              THE COURT: That's right. I'm sorry. Come up here.
17
     Let me see your questionnaire.
18
          Mr. McKnew, you get to go sit back in your seat.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR MCKNEW:
19
                                         Okay.
20
              THE COURT: I'll explain later.
21
          All right. Now we go to?
22
              THE CLERK: Anthony west, W-e-s-t.
23
          All right.
                      Thanks.
              THE COURT: Mr. West, you get to go sit in that
24
25
     first-row seat.
```

```
And the next name, please.
 1
              THE CLERK: Yvonne Brown, B-r-o-w-n.
 2
              THE COURT: Yvonne Brown. Please let me see your
 3
 4
     questionnaire.
 5
          Ms. Brown, welcome. You get to take the number 3 seat in
     the back row.
 6
          It's going to be a little tough for you to manage it, but
 7
     Angie will show you the best way in.
 8
          Next name, please.
 9
              THE CLERK: Luis Torres, T-o-r-r-e-s.
10
11
              THE COURT:
                         Mr. Torres, you get to go sit in your
12
     original seat.
                     Thank you.
                          Jonathan Bruesewitz, I guess. Bruesewitz.
13
              THE CLERK:
              THE COURT: Bruesewitz.
14
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: There it is.
16
           (Laughter)
17
              THE CLERK:
                         Thank you.
              THE COURT:
                         All right. You get to take the empty
18
     seat, please.
19
20
          Angie, would you mind doing these three. Thank you.
          So I'll just ask the three of you who just joined us,
21
22
     Ms. Brown, Mr. Bruesewitz, Mr. West, do you have any hardship
23
     issue you wish to raise?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:
                                       No, sir.
24
              THE COURT: Ms. Brown?
25
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: 1 No. PROSPECTIVE JUROR PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: 2 THE COURT: All right. So no hardship. This is the 3 time to do it. If you get selected, you can't later say, "I 4 5 have a hardship issue." I have that happen every now and then. Somebody gets 6 7 selected for the jury, and then suddenly they're being sworn In the opening statements they say, Wait, wait, wait. I 8 should have told you this. And then I say, You're in for the 9 duration. You have been drafted into the U.S. Army. 10 11 (Laughter) THE COURT: You are in for the duration. You can't 12 13 get out of it later. So this is the time to say something. Okay. Nobody said anything. 14 Okay. Mr. West, can you seat the chart? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: My name is Anthony West. 17 **THE COURT:** Wait. We have to give you the microphone. Who has the microphone? It's right there. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: My name is Anthony West. 19 20 from Concord. 21 Education is high school only. I'm in plumbing. I work for Absolute Plumbing. 22 23 No clubs. Hobbies are action sports and video games. 24 Talk more into the mic. 25 THE COURT:

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: Marital status is single. No children. 2 No prior jury service. 3 Never been in the military. 4 And I've never been a witness. 5 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Please pass the mic to 6 7 Ms. Brown. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: My name is Yvonne Brown. 8 Μy education is back home in the Philippines, high school 9 graduate. I took college, but I didn't finish. And three 10 11 years college. That's all. Was that in the Philippines or here? 12 THE COURT: 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: In the Philippines. THE COURT: 14 Okay. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: I'm not -- I am not 16 experience in -- I am not a member of any organization. 17 And my work is a caregiver right now. And I took up CNA back in Texas. 18 And I don't have much hobbies because I work most of the 19 20 time. 21 And I'm married. I have no experience in military or jury -- any jury or 22 23 any -- or any court witnesses whatsoever. **THE COURT:** So you've got to be here at 7:45 each 24 25 morning all the way through June 10th. Do you understand that

```
1
     part?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: Yes, sir.
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Can you make that time?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: I will try, sir.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: Well, you have to be here. And then --
     and go all the way through 1:00 o'clock each day. Do you
 6
     understand that part?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN:
 8
              THE COURT: Will that be a hardship on you?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN:
10
11
              THE COURT:
                          No?
                               Okay. Thank you.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: Especially going home it's
12
13
     not a hardship.
14
           (Laughter)
                         All right. Mr. Bruesewitz.
15
              THE COURT:
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: My name is Jonathan
16
17
     Bruesewitz. I live in Pleasant Hill, California.
          I have a bachelor of science in international management,
18
19
     with a minor in economics.
20
          My current job is financial analyst with NRT Inc.
21
     are a commercial real estate company.
22
          No clubs or anything like that.
23
          Hobbies, golf when I have time.
          Marital status, newlywed. Spouse, she works for GAP Inc.
24
     as a merchandiser.
25
```

No children. 1 No prior jury service. 2 Did not serve in the military, law enforcement. 3 And have not been a party or witness in court. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Just hold on to the mic for a minute. 6 Now, all of you 16, just to kind of summarize a little 7 bit, if you have been on a prior jury, please raise your hand. 8 (Show of hands.) 9 One, two, three of you. 10 THE COURT: 11 If you were the foreperson on the jury, raise your hand. So nobody has been the foreperson before. All right. 12 I want to tell you, we're -- we're not even halfway done 13 yet so we -- just relax and listen to the questions, and answer 14 15 the questions properly. I want to go over what the jury does, what the important 16 role of the jury is, because, believe it or not, I found in 17 this job -- I used to be a lawyer -- I knew what a jury did, 18 but I find that many people don't because a lot of you haven't 19 served on a jury before. So I'm going to tell you what 20 21 happens. We need ten of you in the end. Ten will be the magic 22 23 And the ten members of the jury are in the jury box. And they are the decision-maker. They decide who wins and who 24 25 loses.

So they have to consider two things in making their decision. One is the -- one side or the other on every issue will have what's called the burden of proof.

So just to take an example on the question of fair use, fair use under the copyright law -- and you'll learn a lot more about this later -- the burden of proof is on Google.

So at the end of the case I will explain to you what it is that Google has to prove in order to carry its burden of proof. And that will involve four factors that Congress has said are the factors to consider. And then you, in your own mind, weigh the factors. But Google is the one who has to carry the burden of proof on that issue. There are other issues in the case where Oracle will have the burden of proof.

Anyway, at the end of all the evidence and at the end of all that segment, you, the jury, ask, Has the party with the burden of proof carried its burden of proof on this issue?

If the answer is yes, and you agree unanimously -- it has to be unanimous. That means all of you agree, all ten. If you all agree that the party with the burden of proof has proven what it needs to, to carry its burden of proof, then that party wins. Your verdict should be for that party.

On the other hand, if they fall short even a little bit and they don't quite persuade you that you've carried their burden of proof, even though they have some good points, maybe, then the party with the burden of proof loses. And it's your

duty to say they lose on that issue.

Now, that's what the jury does. It's like a laboratory experiment. The laboratory is this room. And the data and the evidence that comes in all comes in through witnesses on the witness stand and documents that you will see. And that's the evidence in the case.

And so what you do is you lay that evidence alongside what the elements of proof are that have to be proven, and ask the question, Has the party with the burden of proof done what they have to do to carry their burden of proof?

And if you say yes, they persuaded me, great. If you say no, they didn't persuade me, that's great too. But that's what you do.

And you must lay the facts, as you find them, alongside the areas of proof that are required under the law, and you decide whether or not the party with the burden of proof measured up or not, okay.

I've said that, now, three or four times. But I'm telling you that a lot of people don't know what a jury does. Some people think, well, the judge is going to give us some kind of secret handshake or signal or come into the jury room and tell us how to come out. No. We never do that.

In fact, I will shall -- I don't have a view on who should prevail. But even if I did have a view, then I would never tell you. It's a decision for you to make, not for me to make.

And I would never try to signal to you how you should decide the case.

So with that explanation, you can see it's very -- it's so important that you pay close attention and you listen to the evidence. And you try your best to understand it.

It's going to be technical -- a lot of technical evidence too. And you've got to try hard to understand it and then go into the jury room and see if you -- whether the party with the burden of proof has persuaded you on whatever issue it is.

THE COURT: So now the part that is my responsibility is to tell you what the elements of proof are that have to be proven. That's called the instructions of law. I will tell you what it is; that on every single issue in the case, I will tell you A, B, C and D have to be proven or whatever the test is. I will explain to you what the test is and then you have to be the one to apply it, but you do have to follow my test because I'm telling you, for example, what Congress has told us that we have to do under the Copyright Act and then I convey to you what that is.

These lawyers went to school for three years at least in law school. You get to go to law school for 45 minutes, and I will explain to you what the law is in about 45 minutes, but it's tailor-made to this case, so it's really very efficient so you learn as much law as you need to decide the case.

But the fact part of the case, the facts of the case,

you're going -- this is going to be amazing to you. There are going to be some things these lawyers agree on and some things they -- one side will say the light was red and the other will say the light was green. It's going to be completely the opposite. So you will need to decide maybe who is telling the truth. Or what witnesses are mistaken because on some things, they both can't be right, so you're going to need to make those kind of credibility determinations for yourself. I don't tell you this.

Now, here's another thing that you need to know. I will repeat this several times. As the trial goes on, you're not going to hear much from me. You have heard a lot from me right now, but as the trial goes on, you won't hear much from me. You will hear tons from these lawyers.

Not one word a lawyer ever says in court is evidence. I'm going to repeat that because most of you don't know that.

These opening statements and closing arguments and even the questions that they ask, they are not evidence. The evidence is what the witness agrees to on the stand under oath and what the documents say that come into evidence and the photos and so forth. Yes. That's evidence. But not one word that a lawyer ever says in a courtroom is evidence. Zero. Z-E-R-O. That spells zero.

And that's the single biggest way that a jury can go wrong is by thinking that they heard something out there in the

courtroom that the -- they will say somebody out there said the light was red. And then I hope somebody else on the jury says, That was just the lawyer talking. No witness ever said that. That was just the lawyer talking.

You have to -- these are great lawyers. They're excellent lawyers. But you're going to hear a lot from them, and you must always remember nothing they say is evidence except in the case of a stipulation.

Now, if they ask a question isn't it true the light was red and the witness says yes, that's true, then of course that's evidence. But if the lawyer says isn't it true the light was red and the witness says I don't know, is that evidence? No. It's only evidence that the witness doesn't or at least claims not to know.

All right. So you over there in the jury box have to not only distinguish between which witnesses are telling the truth, you have to keep separate what the lawyers say versus what the actual evidence is. And then use their opening statements and their closing arguments, because they are great lawyers and they're going to make great openings and great closings and they're very useful for you to hear those, but it's -- none of that will be evidence. Even if they play a snippet from some deposition in their opening statement, it's not evidence yet.

All right. So that's what the jury does. And why I'm going into this little speech is you should not be on the jury

if you can't carry out that function. If you're biased toward one side or the other, you shouldn't be on the jury because you've got to be fair to both sides.

If you think that you would have trouble following the law because you don't agree with the way the law is, you can't serve because you've got to follow the law as it is, and if you don't like the law, go to Congress. Run for Congress. But don't sabotage what our Congress has done by not following the law. There are plenty of laws that I don't agree with, but I faithfully follow them because I took an oath to do so, and I -- so you've got to do the same thing when you take your oath.

All right. So that's my little speech about what the jury does. The jury decides the case. I just cannot say that. It's a very solemn and important responsibility. It is a burden, but it is a monumental important function, and this case has gotten a lot of press. It's gotten a lot of publicity. You get to read all about it after the case is over, but not now. And you will be the one to decide which one of these two big companies is right and which one is wrong. And so your decision will go down in the history books. You've got to do it carefully and without any bias at all.

All right. So let me just ask, now that you've heard my talk about -- raise your hand if you think there is something about yourself that would cause you to be unable to do what I

just described. Raise your hand if you think you -- maybe you shouldn't be on this jury.

Mr. Mangels, let's get the microphone down to you.

prospective juror mangels: I don't know if I'm biased or not, but I just didn't like the way Oracle handled when they took over PeopleSoft and then fired everybody.

THE COURT: Well, maybe they had good reasons. I don't know. But you tell me, is that going to be -- you're good to raise it, you're right to raise it. But you would have to -- to be on this jury, you've got to realize that PeopleSoft has zero to do with this case. This case involves a different company, Sun, who got acquired by Oracle, and one of the assets was this Java that came with Sun and that's what we're here for. It has nothing to do with PeopleSoft.

So now if you're telling me you don't like the way that happened and you would hold it against Oracle, okay, maybe you shouldn't serve on this case. So you've got to tell us, what are you trying to tell us?

prospective juror mangels: That's the part I -- I've got to hear things, but it's just the way -- maybe it's the way it was put in through the press the way that some -- PeopleSoft had something. Oracle acquired PeopleSoft and then immediately just shut down the entire operation in Pleasanton and just laid off all the people.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, maybe they did that, but are

```
you able to put that out of your mind? Is that going to -- you
 1
    have to be able to tell me, to be on this jury, Judge, I'll
 2
     forget about PeopleSoft. I know that has nothing to do with
 3
     this case. I'll decide this case fair and square. That's Door
 4
 5
    No. 1.
          Door No. 2 is, Judge, I think that's going to influence me
 6
     and I just wouldn't be able to get it out of my mind and I
 7
     would be a little biased in this case.
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR MANGELS: I think I'm a little biased
 9
     on that --
10
11
              THE COURT:
                         I'm going to excuse Mr. Mangels unless I
    hear an objection.
12
              MR. VAN NEST: No objection, Your Honor.
13
              MR. BICKS: No objection.
14
              THE COURT: You are excused, Mr. Mangels. You get to
15
16
     go back to the jury assembly room. Thank you for your candor.
17
     There is nothing wrong with telling us you had that problem.
18
     Okay? Good luck to you, sir.
          Who is going to replace Mr. Mangels?
19
              THE CLERK: Okay. It's Meenakshi Subbaraman,
20
     S-U-B-B-A-R-A-M-A-N.
21
22
              THE COURT:
                          Subbaraman.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SUBBARAMAN: Subbaraman.
23
              THE COURT: How are you today?
24
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SUBBARAMAN: I'm very good.
```

```
1
     you.
 2
              THE COURT: Just one moment. Let me look at your
            You get to go take Mr. Mangels' seat.
     thing.
 3
          Ms. Subbaraman, do you have any hardship issue?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SUBBARAMAN: I don't. But I do have
     a ticket to leave for Europe on June 9th.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Okay. That's a Thursday; right?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SUBBARAMAN: That is a Thursday.
 8
 9
    And the flight is at 9:00 a.m.
              THE COURT: I'm going to excuse Ms. Subbaraman.
10
                                                               Ι
11
     think we might go that late. All right. Any objection?
              MR. BICKS: No, Your Honor.
12
13
              MR. VAN NEST: No objection, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right. I hope you have a great
14
15
     vacation.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SUBBARAMAN: Thank you.
              THE COURT: Okay. Who's next?
17
              THE CLERK: All right. Juliusnikko Tamayo Tiongco,
18
     t-I-O-N-G-C-O.
19
              THE COURT: You may have that seat up there. It says
20
    here you're in college right now?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: Yes.
22
              THE COURT: Are you missing classes today?
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: No. But I'm currently
24
     enrolled in summer.
25
```

When do your classes start? 1 THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: I think it's June 13. 2 THE COURT: All right. So between now and June 10th, 3 4 do you have any classes? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: No. THE COURT: All right. Do you have any hardship issue 6 you wish to raise? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: 8 THE COURT: Can you see the chart? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: Yeah. 10 11 THE COURT: All right. Please give us the biographical information. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: My name is Juliusnikko 13 Tiongco. I'm from South San Francisco, California. And I'm in 14 15 I am unemployed. I'm not a part of any organization college. 16 or any type of stuff like that. 17 My hobbies are running and video games. I'm single. Ι have no partner. No children. No prior jury service. I have 18 19 never been in the military or been a witness. 20 What are you studying? THE COURT: 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: Right now I'm just taking my prerequisite classes and I'm still deciding on what to major 22 23 in. THE COURT: Okay. Did you hear my talk about what a 24 25 jury does?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Would you have any trouble with being a fair and impartial juror in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to have some random questions here for you. Raise your hand if you have any kind of license other than a driver's license. Like if you had a license to be a plumber, for example, or any other kind of state-issued license, I want you to raise your hand. Okay. We've got several. Okay. Pass the microphone over to Mr. Bruesewitz. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: The only license I have is a license for firearms. Okay. And down here on the front row. THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm licensed by the state as a home improvement salesperson. THE COURT: Okay. Next over here? And say your name, please. PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: Marion Jacobs. I have a nursing license. All right. Then over here. Name, please. THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: You said license. I don't think this is licensed by the state, but about five years --Say seven years ago, I was licensed by a gospel ministry through a church, Foothill Baptist Church.

THE COURT: Very good. Thank you.

Okay. Just so you know what I'm doing, the lawyers and I have talked in advance about some topics I should raise with you. And so out of caution, I'm going to ask you some questions that -- just to see if any of this strikes a bell. If it does, raise your hand.

Okay. Oracle is a sponsor of the America's Cup races. Is there anything about that that might affect your ability to be fair to one side or the other in this case? If so, raise your hand. Some of you may not have even known that, but I suspect there are others of you who do know that. So if you do, regardless, would that affect your ability to be fair and impartial? If you think it might, raise your hand.

Okay. No one is raising their hand.

Question about Google. How many of you have a smartphone?

Raise your hand if you've got a smartphone. Let's see. Okay.

It looks like every single one of you. Isn't that interesting.

Okay. Put your hand down.

Raise your hand if you've got an Android smartphone. So about half of you. Keep your hands up because the lawyers are probably going to want to know. How many of you have an Apple phone? Okay. There you go. If any of you have any other kind of smartphone, raise your hand, like BlackBerry.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I must have Android.

THE COURT: You have Android. What kind do you have?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm confused between Android and PROSPECTIVE JUROR: my phone. I don't know maybe is Android or what is the other one? THE COURT: Apple. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It has Android in my phone. No. THE COURT: Do you have a Samsung phone? **PROSPECTIVE JUROR:** Yes. Samsunq. THE COURT: Okay. All right. Now, those of you who -- regardless of whether you raised your hand to which one of those questions, the -- maybe you're biased one way or the other in favor or against Android, I don't know. I don't know. Maybe you'd be biased for or against Google on account of its position in the marketplace. And if so, if you think in any way that your familiarity with the phone or a competitor's phone would affect your judgment in this case, you need to raise your hand so we can talk about it. So just to -- who down here had raised -- who is it -- are you an Android person? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I have both with me so far. **THE COURT:** You have both of them. The record will show you pointed with one finger to your left pocket and one finger to your right pocket. PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: yes. THE COURT: You've got all bases covered.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: One is personal and one
is work.

THE COURT: All right. So here's the question I've got for you. And you're Mr. Stromsness.

There is going to be -- thank you, Angie. You are going to hear all about Android in this case. But the evidence that you're going to have to base the -- it's like the laboratory again. Your personal phone is not evidence. And what you know from personal experience is not evidence. It's going to be the evidence here in the courtroom that matters.

Are you able to decide this case based on the evidence in the case, or do you think you're going to be influenced one way or the other by what you know about the systems?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I believe I would be able to decide it based on the evidence in the case.

THE COURT: All right. Do any of the rest of you feel that you would have a problem separating all that out? Okay.

No one is raising their hand. Let's move on.

How about a company that you're going to hear a large amount in this case about that is called Sun Microsystems that used to be a very prominent company in the Bay Area, but it was acquired by Oracle and is now known as Oracle America so it still exists but has a different name.

Back in the era of when it was called Sun, we are going to have a lot of witnesses' testimony about that era. Do any of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
you have some connection with Sun or some great fond memories
of Sun that might influence you in this case? If so, raise
your hand. Okay.
    Ms. Rocha.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: I used to work for a work
training facility, and Sun Microsystems was one of the
companies that were training the people that I served.
         THE COURT: Did you personally go out to Sun's
premises?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: They were -- Sun had an
office inside the building where I worked. It was a training
program.
                    And did you personally interact at Sun?
         THE COURT:
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA:
         THE COURT: Do you think the -- that connection will
influence you pro or con in this case?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA:
         THE COURT: All right. That's fine.
     Anyone else? Okay. Oh, wait. Wait. Mr. Stromsness.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I've used a lot of
different companies' hardware in the past, including Sun's, but
you asked about going to their headquarters. I have been
invited to executive briefing centers for most of the tech
companies. I have been to most of them. I was at Sun's
headquarters once for half a day for a briefing.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is there anything about their hardware or THE COURT: that experience with Sun that would influence you one way or the other in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I don't believe so. THE COURT: Anyone else? Down there. Mr. Haley. PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Just for full disclosure, one of our old buildings was at one point Sun Microsystems' headquarters. We had sold to them. And obviously in that function, we did buy a lot of their hardware back in the day. THE COURT: Did you find any secret documents behind the radiator? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: No. Didn't find them. THE COURT: You said you bought some of their equipment; right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Sure. THE COURT: So did you have any particularly good or particularly bad experience with the equipment? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: No. THE COURT: Is there any way that equipment is going to influence you in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: No. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone else? Okay. Good. So we know a couple of you already. But raise your hand if you believe you're good with computers. One, two, three --

```
keep them up high. One, two, three, four, five. Okay.
 1
                                                              I may
     let the lawyers just follow up themselves. All right.
 2
     your hands down.
 3
          Raise your hands if you subscribe to any computer
 4
 5
     magazines. Zero. Okay.
         How about if you subscribe to some computer magazine
 6
 7
     online, raise your hand. No one does that. Okay.
         How many of you can program in any language whatsoever,
 8
     even in the simplest languages? How many of you can program in
 9
     software, write code? One -- one person. Okay.
10
11
         And how many of you have ever heard of application program
     interface? One, two. Okay. All right.
12
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Excuse me, Your Honor.
              THE COURT:
14
                          Three.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just the term --
15
              THE COURT: Have you ever heard that term, application
16
17
    program interface?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Maybe. I don't know.
              THE COURT: You don't know.
19
         Mr. Haley, you have heard of it?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Yes, sir.
21
              THE COURT: Okay. In what context did you hear about
22
     it?
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Work-related. You know,
24
25
    back in the day, we used to do a lot of COTS program -- COTS
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

software development programs where you have to have a lot of interfaces between the different software that you'd buy. THE COURT: All right. PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: And then just general knowledge just from reading. Okay. Now, this case involves -- it's THE COURT: already an established fact in this case that Oracle America has a copyright on certain aspects that are at issue in this case on what we are going to refer to as an application programming interface, and more particularly, declaring lines of code. So let me just stop there. Have you ever heard the phrase declaring line of code? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: No. THE COURT: How about you, Mr. Stromsness? Do you know what a declaring line of code is? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Yes, I do. THE COURT: Okay. Now, again, I have to ask you this question, is there anything about that body of knowledge that you already have which is going to cause you to be biased one way or the other in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I do not believe so. Okay. How many of you have ever heard of THE COURT: the term open source software? Open source software? two, three. Okay. Mr. Stromsness, what have you heard about that term?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I've worked at U.C. 1 Berkeley and Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, and they are known 2 to some extent for the Berkeley system distribution and 3 Berkeley Internet name daemon for open source package of 4 5 software from the 80s that are very popular', so I know some of the people who worked on the periphery of those projects over 6 7 the course of the years. THE COURT: All right. Well, now, the open source 8 software is a -- tell me -- you, I'm sure, know more than I do 9 about this so I'm going to ask you, is this something that is 10 11 controversial within the programmer profession, the term open 12 source? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I don't think the term 13 is particularly controversial. 14 15 THE COURT: But the concept? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I think it's pretty 17 well established now. It was more controversial, I think, 20 years ago. I think pretty much all the companies that have 18 paid software now also support open source software of one form 19 or another as well. 20 THE COURT: So in this case, there is going to be 21 testimony and evidence about -- in the background about open 22

testimony and evidence about -- in the background about oper source software. Can you decide the case based on what the evidence here is in the courtroom, or are you going to be filling in the blanks with what you know about it yourself?

23

24

PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I think I can base it 1 2 just on what's in the courtroom. THE COURT: All right. Now, again, I need to say the 3 plaintiff here, which is Oracle, it is established and we can't 4 5 deviate from the fact that unless fair use is established in this case, Oracle has the right to enforce its copyright and it 6 7 does not have any duty to do any open source whatsoever. That's going to be the law. 8 So the issue is going to come down solely to whether or 9 not Google can carry the burden of proof to show fair use. 10 11 Maybe it can; maybe it can't. I don't know. That's for the 12 jury. 13 But you can't be substituting your judgment in saying well, I like open source so I'm going to go with open source 14 15 and that's -- that's not -- we're past that. Do you understand 16 that? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I do. THE COURT: But we're going to hear evidence about it 18 anyway because it relates to some of the other issues. 19 20 right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: 21 Yes. THE COURT: Again, I ask you will you decide the case 22 23 fairly and impartially based on what happens here in the courtroom? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: 25 Yes.

```
1
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. Anybody ever heard of the term open
 2
     source software? Okay.
          Mr. Bruesewitz, your turn. How did you hear about it?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: This was just during,
 4
 5
     you might say, academia. A lot of lottery searchers at
     different universities were using open source software to
 6
 7
     actually transmit and give people options of looking at things.
              THE COURT: Did you hear what I said to
 8
    Mr. Stromsness, our No. 1 juror down here? Did you hear our
 9
     conversation?
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: Yes.
11
12
              THE COURT: Are you able to put to one side what you
13
     heard in your life on open source and base the case solely on
     what you hear in the courtroom?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ:
15
                                             I am.
              THE COURT: Will you do that fairly and impartially?
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ:
17
                                             Yes.
              THE COURT: Who else raised their hand?
18
19
          Mr. Haley, same questions to you.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Mostly just general
20
    knowledge, and I don't think there would be an issue with
21
22
     deciding on the evidence presented.
23
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Okay.
          A different question. How many of you have ever worked in
24
25
    new product development? New product development.
```

raise your hand. 1 Mr. Haley, you've been a busy man in your life. Tell us 2 about your new product development. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Well, as part of my 4 5 responsibilities in the corporation, one of the things we did was managing the IRD budget and so one of my principal 6 7 functions was to assess where we should spend our dollars and the expected outcome of those expenditures and how to measure 8 that. 9 So it was basically looking at, you know, the market 10 11 return, the competing products out there, and the whole life cycle of the investment. 12 THE COURT: All right. Will that in any way influence 13 your ability to decide this case fairly and squarely? 14 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: 16 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 17 Anyone else on new product development? 18 Yes, Ms. Hines? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: So at Pacific Gas & 19 20 Electric, we are a utility, so our products are mainly 21 regarding options for customers, so I have worked on customize 22 your payment schedule and what we're calling the rate mailer. 23 So different avenues that we're outreaching to customers and, you know, products that a utility could offer. 24 25 THE COURT: All right. Same question. Can you put

that to one side and decide the case here solely on the 1 evidence here in the courtroom? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: Yes. 3 THE COURT: And do that impartially for both sides? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 6 7 Different question. Have any of you ever been involved in licensing of intellectual property, patents, copyrights, 8 trademarks, trade secrets, anything like that? Licensing. 9 right. 10 11 Again, Mr. Haley. PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Same thing, part of my 12 13 responsibilities in my work career was to basically assess the -- the licensing costs as part of the budgeting exercise 14 15 and whether or not it was worth our effort. 16 THE COURT: Do you have any legal background? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Only through business law as 18 part of my educational background and then of course some of my 19 responsibilities had a very tight interplay with the legal 20 organization. I was responsible for contract negotiations, the 21 business terms and conditions, that sort of thing. 22 Did you ever actually read one of these THE COURT: 23 license agreements? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Not a license agreement so 24 25 much, but I have read a number of patents.

1 THE COURT: Okay. How about copyrights? Ever have 2 any experience with copyrights? **PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY:** Not directly, no, sir. 3 THE COURT: Okay. There is no patents in this case, 4 5 so this is strictly a copyright case. PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Understood. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Anyone else want to raise their hand to that question about licensing? Okay. No one. 8 All right. So let me ask a question I normally would not 9 ask, but because of the length of this trial, you know, I've 10 11 told you that you cannot, you must not, cannot do Google research or any kind of research about this case, even though 12 you would be tempted to do that until you are at the end and 13 discharged and the case is over. Then you can do all the 14 15 research you want. And you can even hold a press conference, 16 whatever you want to do. At that point, there is no admonition, no restriction. But until that point, you would 17 18 have to be true blue to what I told you. Now, I've had some jurors who just can't do that. 19 just -- they get on their phone, they say, The judge will never 20 know. I'll just do this anyway. We find out one way or the 21 other. 22

If you think you just can't help it and you would violate

that direct order not to go do research about the case, I want

you to raise your hand now because we need to talk about it.

23

24

Okay.

Mr. Tiongco, let's hear what you have to say.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: Well, I spend a lot of time on the Internet and I find this trial a little interesting so I might be tempted to search it up once I get home.

THE COURT: Yeah. Okay. Now, when you're there, what would you do? Be sitting in a nice easy chair and TV going in the background and you look around, you see the judge can't see me here; right? So you would be thinking okay, I'm going to put in some keywords about this case. That's what you're saying you might do that; right?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: Yes

THE COURT: And would you even think about the fact that I told you -- that I have given you a direct order not to do that?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO: Yes, I would, but it would
be really hard not to, like, search it up.

THE COURT: So that's a problem. You know, I'll just tell you, there is propaganda out there on the Internet about this case both ways. And if you were to read one of the propaganda for one side or the other side and be influenced by that, it would be a travesty of justice because those people are just propagandists, and they -- first of all, that's number one.

Number two, half of them don't know what they're talking

```
That's the other thing.
 1
     about.
          And number three and most important, it's outside the
 2
     evidence in the case.
 3
          So you're telling me, though, notwithstanding my little
 4
 5
     lecture here, you're going to do it anyway? Is there a 50/50
     chance that you would do it?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR TIONGCO:
 7
                                          I think so.
              THE COURT: I'm going to excuse him, unless there is
 8
     an objection?
 9
              MR. VAN NEST: No objection, Your Honor.
10
11
              MR. BICKS:
                         No, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: I want you to know there are other big
12
13
     antitrust cases that are going to go even longer than five
14
     weeks.
            Maybe we can get you into one of those. And it may be
15
     they don't care whether you're trying to look them up because
16
     it's a nobody case and nobody cares about it and there is
17
     nothing on the Internet anyway.
          So I hope you get on one of those cases, but this is not
18
     the case for you.
19
          So you go back to the jury assembly room and tell them
20
     what happened. Thank you, sir. Thank you for being candid.
21
22
          Let's replace that seat.
                         Barbara Kreslake, K-R-E-S-L-A-K-E.
23
              THE CLERK:
                         How do you spell that?
24
              THE COURT:
```

THE CLERK: K-R-E-S-L-A-K-E.

THE COURT: Kreslake. 1 2 Is that right, Kreslake? PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: 3 THE COURT: Kreslake. All right. Let's see your 4 5 write-up. Okay. You get to have that last seat over there. 6 And here's this. 7 Ms. Kreslake, may I give you the microphone. Who has that? Welcome to the jury box. How are you today? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Fine. Thank you. 9 Good. Do you have a hardship issue? 10 THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: 11 No. THE COURT: Can you see that chart from that distance? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Please give us the info. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: my name is Barbara 15 16 Kreslake. I live in San Carlos. I have an Associate's degree. I'm a homemaker. Previously years ago I was San Mateo County 17 Community College. No organizations, although my husband is 18 involved in the union and I help out. 19 Hobbies, yoqa, swimming, hiking. I'm married. My husband 20 is retired from the U.S. Postal Service and previously he was a 21 22 metrologist at United Airlines. 23 I have three children: 43 and 38 and 36. The oldest is airline occupation. The second one is a researcher. 24 25 started a new company in Bethesda, Maryland. And the third one

is international relations and she's searching for a job. 1 No prior jury service. No military or law enforcement. 2 And I have never been a witness. 3 Great. Did you hear all the questions I 4 THE COURT: 5 asked? PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: 6 THE COURT: 7 Would you have raised your hand to any of those? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: No. 9 THE COURT: Did you hear my description about what the 10 11 jury does? PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: 12 Yes. 13 THE COURT: And would you be able to faithfully and impartially carry out that responsibility? 14 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Yes. 16 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. So just -- I'm getting close to where I'm going to turn 17 the questioning over for a while to the lawyers. And just so 18 19 you'll know, the lawyers have a copy of your questionnaire. And they may -- it's okay if they ask you questions about it. 20 Every now and then, it's rare, but I would say if you have 21 something highly personal and private that you feel like you 22 23 should tell us about, then -- but you want to do it just with me and the lawyers at what's called a sidebar, I will allow 24 25 that. I discourage it, but I will allow it if you really want

```
1
     it.
          So I want you to know that that opportunity is there.
          So at this time, I'm going to let -- Mr. Bicks, are you
 2
     ready? Are you going to be the one?
 3
                          Yes, Your Honor.
 4
              MR. BICKS:
                                            Thank you.
 5
                          Why don't you do this.
                                                  Reintroduce
              THE COURT:
     everyone at your table so we all have in mind who everyone is
 6
 7
     at your table and then you get the floor for a while.
                         Thank you.
 8
              MR. BICKS:
          So I quess it's good morning. So at our table, this is
 9
     Matt Sarboraria from Oracle and Georges Saab also from Oracle,
10
11
     and Gabe Ramsey, who works with me at Orrick Herrington, and
     Lisa Simpson and Annette Hurst and Mark Phillips.
12
13
              THE COURT:
                         You know, a question I forgot to ask, and
     maybe you could do it for me and I will give you a couple extra
14
15
     minutes, is whether or not anybody knows any of the lawyers or
16
     the judge or the court personnel. I forget to ask that.
17
     you wouldn't mind doing that for me, I would appreciate it.
              MR. BICKS: So as I say, I'm from Orrick Herrington,
18
     and I quess I should ask everyone here, does anyone know any of
19
     the folks here who are with me or anyone at our firm or anyone
20
     in the Court, any of the Court personnel?
21
                                 Thank you. Over there,
22
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
23
    Ms. Kreslake.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Our next-door neighbor
24
```

works for Oracle and my closest friend used to work for Oracle.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ι

MR. BICKS: Understood. And actually when I say Orrick, our firm is called Orrick Herrington. Our client is Oracle. PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: I see, okay. MR. BICKS: And in terms of Ms. Kreslake, the folks that you know from Oracle, is that something that in any way is going to influence you in the case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: MR. BICKS: All right. Thank you. So this is a great opportunity for me -- and thank you, Your Honor. This will be really the only time that I would get to speak with you directly, and I really appreciate it. I'm going to ask some individual follow-up questions and then some more general questions, and if I don't ask an individual question, it's just because we've got time here and I want to go as efficiently as I can. Mr. Stromsness, can I just start with you, sir? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Sure. MR. BICKS: You, I think, have indicated in your questionnaire that you've read -- you've heard a little bit about this case, and I want to just ask you what kind of details have you heard? **PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS:** Not very many. I've seen it in headlines and seen some stories about it.

been a while. I didn't realize the case was still going on.

don't really remember what has gone on in the case, but I knew 1 that there was a lawsuit about Android. 2 MR. BICKS: You mentioned, I think, something called 3 the EFF. Tell me what that is. 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I don't remember exactly what it stands for. It's an Internet freedom group. Ι 6 think E stands for electronic. But -- and I had started 7 supporting them when they were supporting some websites back in 8 the day that had gay and lesbian conduct that people tried to 9 get taken down. And so I've given them, I think, maybe 225 10 11 bucks per year since then. MR. BICKS: Any knowledge of any positions any 12 organizations like that have taken in any way about this case? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: 14 No. 15 MR. BICKS: Thank you. 16 Let me, Mr. Haley, just speak with you for a moment. 17 In terms of your experience that you mentioned in 18 connection with overseeing of litigation, things like that, can 19 you just describe a little bit what exactly you were doing? Ι 20 think you were overseeing some patent litigation, things of 21 that nature? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Well, general. 22 If it had 23 actually gone to litigation, I would be sort of behind the

I would be sitting down with the lawyers and

understanding the strategy. One of my functions was on the

24

accounting side of it, I had to try to figure out what the risk assessment was, and obviously if there was an issue associated that had a financial impact, I had to capture that somehow in financials.

In terms of the overview of the budgeting process, my recollection was we had a fairly sizeable line item in the indirect budget for patents, and so the whole aspect of retaining and the dollar expended, as well as the employee rewards for achieving a patent, were part of my overview. I wouldn't say I was the decision-maker, but I was one of two or three.

MR. BICKS: Any attitudes on patent lawsuits in general? Some people say there are too many; people shouldn't be bringing these kind of cases. Some people have different views.

Do you have views one way or the other on that?

prospective juror haley: On the patent side, I guess -- I did have one bad experience. We lost a very large patent lawsuit. It was litigated after I had already left the firm, but the -- all the runup to it was under my watch. It was sort of a surprise what the Patent Office would issue patents for. And the conflict was really around industry practice versus something that was patentable, and it also got involved with co-development.

MR. BICKS: With what? I'm sorry.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Co-development. PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Our typical contracts would have basically in the contract itself -- it would call for whoever brought the idea owned the idea, and if it was jointly developed, then it was split, and of course in my world, the products we built had very much a collaborative aspect to it in terms of defining and developing the product between the customer and the manufacturer. MR. BICKS: And so given -- the judge briefed a little bit about the case. How do you think, if at all, that experience might impact how you come to this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: I think it gives me a certain level of familiarity with some of the legalese and some of the arguments that lawyers put forth, but I have no knowledge of specifics on this particular case. MR. BICKS: Thank you. And is it Mr. Kotlar? PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Yes. MR. BICKS: So you indicate that I think you have heard something about this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: You know, something in passing in the news. I don't know if I paid attention. know, Channel 2, Dave Clark. You know that dude? I might have been getting ready for work or help my wife get ready for work and might have heard something about the case, but no

specifics. The dollar amounts were here. I didn't know there

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
was that much money being haggled over before I got to this
courtroom. So I don't -- I might have, but I'm not actually
sure.
        MR. BICKS: Anyone else hear anything about the case
that would be worth discussing? Anyone read anything, seen
anything about it? Thank you.
    Ms. Harper.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER:
        MR. BICKS: So I think you indicate that your brother
has some contact with Oracle.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: My understanding is he just
started working for -- my understanding is he just started
working for them again. He has worked for several of the large
software companies. He is a computer programmer and works with
new product development.
         MR. BICKS: You're understanding is he works at Oracle
now?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Correct.
         MR. BICKS:
                     Okay.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Oracle America.
                                                     I'm not
sure which.
         MR. BICKS: Understood.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER:
                                   Brand new job.
         MR. BICKS: Where does he work? Do you know?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: I don't. He just mentioned

it when we saw him at Easter. 1 MR. BICKS: I understand. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: He lives in the East Bay. 3 MR. BICKS: How do you think -- we represent Oracle. 4 5 And Google's on the other side. Do you think that situation with your brother could influence your views on this case? 6 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: I do not. Obviously I felt like full disclosure was necessary. 8 MR. BICKS: Yes. Thank you. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: On the jury, you make a 10 11 commitment to review the facts as set forth, so . . . MR. BICKS: I'll try to pronounce it right. 12 Ms. Calonsag. You mentioned Sureline Systems? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR CALONSAG: 14 Yes. MR. BICKS: Tell me a little bit about that company 15 16 again. PROSPECTIVE JUROR CALONSAG: To be honest, I'm not 17 really that familiar with the high tech. It's -- my husband 18 throws a lot of high tech jargon, but it's a little confusing 19 to me. It has something to do with platforms. So that's as 20 far as I know. 21 22 Thank you. MR. BICKS: 23 And, Ms. Hines, I think you have indicated that you have had some contact with Oracle. Any part of that experience that 24 25 might color you being on this case if you ended up on it?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: No. MR. BICKS: Let me ask just more generally about Oracle and hear folks' attitudes about Oracle. Many of you may have heard, obviously, about Oracle cloud computing, database, hardware. The question that is really on our mind, both sides, is having people that won't lean really one way or the other. Any folks kind of have negative feelings about Oracle? won't hurt my feelings if you say it. But anyone here kind of have negative feelings about Oracle? (A show of hands by the prospective jurors in the box) MR. BICKS: Anyone here heard of Mr. Ellison? (A show of hands by the prospective jurors in the box) MR. BICKS: And anyone, based on that information, you know, have opinions or thoughts of him that kind of lean on the negative side based on any of that? How about on the positive side? Tell me -- tell me about that. Say your name again, so the record will be THE COURT: clear. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: Jonathan Bruesewitz. Anybody who can buy Lanai, I mean, come on. I'm a golfer so that's kind of cool. Anybody who can buy what? THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: He purchased Lanai, the island in Hawaii. THE COURT: All right. Okay. I just didn't

understand what you said. I got it.

MR. BICKS: And remind me again, the folks that we discussed the topic of open source. And, Mr. Stromsness, I remember you knew about it; Mr. Haley; and Mr. Bruesewitz.

So on the question of open source, do you -- do either -- any of you have views on whether or not software, just as an attitude view, should be given away for free, that are leaning one way or the other on that? If I asked you Mr. Stromsness, what were your views on that, would -- help me out.

anything philosophical about the question. I mean, I think that we need high-quality software that's secure and that probably always means someone is working on making it secure. Whether that's because it's, you know, commercially licensed software or just because things like, you know, Linux where lots of companies want to put time into it, I don't think it really matters as long as you can get quality software.

MR. BICKS: I would love to hear, Mr. Haley, any thoughts from you on this?

prospective juror Haley: Well, as you might imagine,
my first thought is how do they make money.

MR. BICKS: Yeah.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: But I understand there is a lot of different models out there. When I hear something is being given away for free, that's the first place my mind goes.

```
And, Mr. Bruesewitz, what are you thoughts
 1
              MR. BICKS:
     on that?
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: I don't really have an
 3
     opinion either way. It was just in academia that I heard about
 4
 5
     it.
                          The judge mentioned Java, but not coffee.
              MR. BICKS:
 6
    But folks here have familiarity with Java? Heard about it?
 7
                          Raise your hands a little higher, please.
 8
              THE COURT:
              MR. BICKS:
                         So let's go one by one. Tell me, sir,
 9
    Mr. Stromsness, your experience.
10
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: In 1994, '95 in computer
     science, the class started out trying to program in Java, but
12
     then decided it wasn't mature enough at the time and we moved
13
     back to C++. Since then, I have mainly been involved in
14
15
    patching it on my work stations.
16
              MR. BICKS: Say it again. You said you have mainly
17
    been involved with what?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Patching it.
                                                           Updating
18
     it as new updates come out.
19
20
              MR. BICKS: Do you have views about Java, good, bad,
21
     things of that nature?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I mean, it's software.
22
23
     It's a useful tool. Lots of people use it.
                                                  They do
     conferencing software frequently.
24
25
              MR. BICKS:
                          Thank you.
```

```
Ms. Rocha, did you tell me your experience with Java?
 1
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: Just on my computer.
     Telling me to update the Java updates. That's about it.
 3
              MR. BICKS: And do you do the updates and things like
 4
 5
     that?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: Yes.
 6
                                              I allow it.
              MR. BICKS: And, Ms. Shattuck, did you --
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Yeah. Recently I've been
 8
     trying to do something with my computer at home, and I don't
 9
     even have the right words to say what it is it's telling me.
10
11
     But it's telling me that I don't have Java or Java's
     misbehaving and I need to update. Maybe that was what it was
12
13
     telling me to do.
          And I've had a lot of trouble doing what it told me what
14
15
     to do. So maybe I've been a little impatient with whoever
16
     wrote the directions for Java. Like, I don't get it. And it's
17
     frustrating. But I have every confidence that in my lifetime,
     I will figure it out. Maybe.
18
                         Mr. West, share with us your experience.
19
              MR. BICKS:
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: Using Java, I just know of it
21
     from general computer use. Nothing more than that.
22
              MR. BICKS: Do you work with it in any kind of
23
     frequency?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: Not that I know of.
24
25
              MR. BICKS: And, Mr. Wong, tell me your experience.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR WONG: To me, Java is just add-on
software that they -- it pops up on your computer. I really
don't know what it does. If I don't really need it for the
application I'm using, I'll pass on it.
         MR. BICKS:
                     Thank you.
     Ms. Jacobs, do you?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: As much as I know, it's a
computer term. I couldn't tell you much further than that.
         MR. BICKS: Mr. Haley, I bet you know a lot about it.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: I know a lot about a lot of
things, very thin, though. So I don't know a whole lot of
depth.
     I seem to recall that Java was developed by Sun and was
giving it back away, back in the late '60s -- late '90s, I
         I do know it's one of the skill sets we often
believe.
advertise when we're looking for employees in the software
area.
         MR. BICKS: Mr. Kotlar, do you have experience with --
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Perhaps, but I have more
experience with java that you drink than Java on a computer,
but I don't like either one -- I don't know about Java, but I
don't like coffee myself.
         MR. BICKS:
                     Thanks.
     Ms. Kreslake.
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: The only experience is

```
with updating, which I agree. I have had problems with it.
 1
     That's about it.
 2
              MR. BICKS:
                         Ms. Hines,.
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: Same with me, just updating,
 4
 5
     make sure the script is the updated version especially so you
 6
     can use it. Especially at PG&E, we have a lot of secure
    networks. So dealing with it at home and work, as well.
 7
              MR. BICKS: Ms. Calonsag.
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR CALONSAG: Same answer.
 9
                                                         It just
     comes up on my computer every now and then that it needs to be
10
    updated.
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SETTLES: Just familiar as a
12
13
     computer term. I haven't had any problem with it one way or
     the other.
14
15
              MR. BICKS:
                          Thank you.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: My company uses Oracle
17
     with obviously Java for their APAR through my work. I don't
18
     work with it directly, but I know we use it.
              MR. BICKS: Any experiences one way or the other that
19
20
    would kind of --
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: Like I said, I don't
22
     really use it, so . . .
23
              MR. BICKS: I didn't mean to skip you, Ms. Brown.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: I have no knowledge about
24
25
            I just saw it on a billboard. That's it.
     Java.
```

```
1
              MR. BICKS:
                          Thank you.
          Mr. Roberds?
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERDS: I've no familiarity with
 3
     it. Just familiar with updating it. I don't even know what it
 4
 5
     does.
              MR. BICKS:
                          Thank you.
 6
 7
          Ms. Harper.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Only as an end user.
 8
 9
              MR. BICKS:
                          Thank you.
          Let me turn to the topic of Google. As the judge has
10
11
     indicated, we're Oracle. Google is over here.
          How many folks on the -- sitting in front of me have
12
13
     experience and use Google things on kind of a regular basis, by
     a show of hand?
14
                         I'm sorry, Ms. Brown, I couldn't hear you.
15
              MR. BICKS:
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: Is it on the phone?
17
            I don't use computer.
    phone?
              THE COURT: Are you -- we need the microphone to you.
18
     But are you saying -- are you asking --
19
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: I'm asking if it's in
     computer or because it's always on the phone that there is --
21
22
              THE COURT: She is asking are you talking about on the
23
     desktop computer? Are you talking about on the phone? She is
     confused.
24
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: And there is Google on the
```

phone. 1 Do you have experience with on the phone 2 MR. BICKS: or the desktop? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: No. Actually, I'm 4 5 illiterate when it comes to computer, but I know how to talk to 6 Google and some of the things on my phone. 7 MR. BICKS: So if I put out the question how many people think Google is an innovative company, you know, that 8 has done things that really made a big difference, by a show of 9 10 hands, how many people would say that that's true? 11 So if I compared -- how many people, if I asked the same folks, who said Google is an innovative company, if I asked is 12 Oracle an innovative company, how many, by show of hands --13 what would folks say? 14 15 And to those of you who I think I can see are raising 16 hands both ways, does any one of you think that when you look 17 at kind of Google and Oracle together, kind of starting out at 18 the starting line, that Google would be starting out a little 19 bit ahead, you know, because of experiences that you've had 20 kind of compared to Google? And it may not necessarily be 21 strong, but kind of starting out a little bit ahead? 22 You mean in this trial? THE COURT: 23 MR. BICKS: Yes. THE COURT: 24 So --25 MR. BICKS: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Let's be clear. What counsel is asking is are there any of you over there who would think in your own mind that in your own mind, Google has a slight advantage over Oracle merely because of your impressions of the companies going in? That's what you're asking; right? MR. BICKS: Yes. Raise your hand if you think in your own THE COURT: mind that's true. MR. BICKS: Let me talk a little bit about the question of damages. (No hands raised) MR. BICKS: The Court mentioned in the beginning that this is a case involving a large amount of damages and that will be the request from Oracle, and the judge will instruct on the law and things of that nature. But my question is I would like to explore people's attitudes about damages. This case is a case that Oracle's position is that it involves damages that involve billions of I think the Court mentioned that. When anybody heard that, did they kind of cringe a little bit and say wow, you know, that's -- that hits you in a way

that you kind of think doesn't sound right? Anyone kind of have that reaction when they heard that?

Anyone have kind of attitudes that businesses should work

things out and shouldn't come into court and ask for a lot of 1 2 money? Anyone kind of have those views? Nobody has views on biq damages? 3 Ms. Hines -- Ms. Hines; right? 4 THE COURT: 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: Yes. THE COURT: Ms. Hines raised her hand. 6 7 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES:** Obviously the company that I work for is also under trial to go to federal court. We just 8 got postponed. Lots of money is involved as well for the 9 San Bruno accident that had occurred. 10 11 MR. BICKS: Yes. **PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES:** So they give us updates on 12 13 the trial that's happening as well, PG&E employees, to kind of know as they know what's going on. Similar talk is going on at 14 15 my work as well. 16 MR. BICKS: So what are your, Ms. Hines, just general 17 kind of attitudes? You heard a mention of what this case 18 involved. What do you think? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: It was interesting how kind 19 20 of I feel, especially at my company; right? You know both 21 sides of the story, kind of how you feel as an employee versus 22 also how you feel of the situation that had occurred itself. 23 So it just was bringing up that for me, mainly what we're dealing with at work and kind of how it feels in the courtroom 24

versus what you feel as an employee.

Ms. Kreslake, the question of damages, 1 MR. BICKS: when you heard the numbers involved, what was your reaction? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: I really don't have a 3 problem with that. I mean, bringing it to court. We live in 4 5 This is the right of every citizen and company, so I don't -- I really didn't think one way or another in the amount 6 of damages because big companies, worth a lot of money. 7 MR. BICKS: And, Mr. Kotlar, I can see you nodding. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Oh, well, I was thinking 9 about the case. Like I mentioned when the judge asked a 10 11 question about the prior jury service, that you know, if it's warranted, you know, based on the case and the facts of the 12 case, if the party is -- is deemed worthy of the damages, then 13 we had to find for -- ours was just a preliminary hearing. 14 Ιt 15 was going to another -- to see what -- and so we found for, I 16 think, millions of dollars because mesothelioma is incurrable, 17 I suppose. That's a different kind of damage. But, yes, I don't have any problem with when based on the 18 facts of the case, if it's warranted, then I don't have a 19 20 problem. MR. BICKS: Ms. Jacobs, I would love to hear your 21 22 thoughts on that topic. PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: I think that's what our 23

prospective juror jacobs: I think that's what our system is for, is to solve disputes between individuals and companies and I think that's what the whom system is for.

24

1 MR. BICKS: Thank you. Mr. Wong, any attitudes on damages and things of that 2 nature? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WONG: No. None. This seems like a 4 5 dispute between products, and I figure if the product justifies itself in its own way, this trial is justified. 6 7 MR. BICKS: Thank you. And, Mr. West, share with me your thoughts on damages. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: I don't really have any views 9 as far as the amounts, the damages that go, but I know you 10 11 asked earlier about the software thing. Software is something I think that in general is something that you should be 12 compensated for. It shouldn't be free. 13 I didn't quite -- say it again. 14 MR. BICKS: PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: The only thing I can think of 15 16 is that I do think software should be compensated for. 17 free source thing that you were talking about earlier, that's 18 the only thing that I would have an opposing view on. MR. BICKS: Yeah. Understood. 19 And, Ms. Shattuck, tell me your thoughts. You heard that. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: I really don't have any. 21 22 MR. BICKS: Thank you. 23 Ms. Rocha, your views. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: Well, I figured big 24

companies, big money. It goes together.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Mr. Stromsness, are your thoughts?
         MR. BICKS:
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Yeah.
                                               I mean, the
amount didn't surprise me. Most of the tech suits seem to be
for billions of dollars these days. Yeah, I'm not sure what
the law is but, you know, nothing surprises me or seems wrong
to me.
                    Ms. Harper, could you share with us your
         MR. BICKS:
thoughts.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Well, initially when you
hear billions, that seems like a lot, but the size of the
companies, I recognize that we're talking about billions isn't
the same to a company like Google or Oracle as it is to my
personal checking account.
     I have no opinion either way on damages.
         MR. BICKS:
                     Thank you.
     Mr. Roberds.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROBERDS: I pretty much don't have
an opinion either. Big company, big money.
         MR. BICKS: Thank you.
     Ms. Brown.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: This is my first time to
hear billions of dollars, but I have no opinion regarding whose
ever stand for their rights.
         MR. BICKS:
                    Yes.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: No comments.
                                                 That's it.
```

```
MR. BICKS:
 1
                          Thank you.
 2
          Mr. Bruesewitz, your --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: I'm fine with damages.
 3
     However, to me there should be some proof of how you get to
 4
 5
     that dollar figure. The million dollars for the woman who
    burnt her tongue on hot coffee --
 6
                         McDonald's.
 7
              MR. BICKS:
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: Yeah. So damages is
 8
     fine, but to me it's got to be something you can actually prove
 9
     some type of dollar amount for.
10
11
              MR. BICKS:
                         Ms. Settles.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SETTLES: When I first heard the
12
     number, it kind of jolted me a little bit, but Oracle and
13
     Google, like you said, large companies, and I don't know how
14
15
     the damages are -- how they're brought into court, how it's
16
     agreed upon.
                   So . . .
17
              MR. BICKS: Mr. West, your point on, I think, the
     software, as I understood, you were saying you thought it
18
19
     should be paid for?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:
                                              Basically I'm
                                       Yeah.
     saying --
21
22
              THE COURT: You have to speak clearly and into the
23
    microphone. I can't hear you.
                         I'm having a problem.
24
              MR. BICKS:
25
              THE COURT:
                         Say it again.
```

```
1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:
                                       Yeah.
                                              Basically I just am
    not exactly -- I wouldn't -- I don't know how to put it.
 2
                                                                Ι
     don't believe in the free source -- the concept of it.
 3
              MR. BICKS:
                          Yeah.
 4
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:
                                       But --
 5
              THE COURT: You do or you don't believe?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:
                                       I don't believe.
 7
              THE COURT: You do not. Tell me if we got it right.
 8
     You do not believe in free software?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:
                                       No, sir.
10
11
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
                                 Thank you.
                         Can I just -- can you explain why you say
12
              MR. BICKS:
     that?
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:
                                       I would say it's just the way
14
     I was raised and brought up. I don't believe anything to be
15
16
     free, especially if it was something that somebody came up with
17
     out of their own -- something that came out of somebody's head
     deserves to be compensated for.
18
              MR. BICKS: So in hearing the discussion that we've
19
    been having, does anyone say to themselves, you know, that this
20
     is a case you think that, you know, may not be the right case?
21
     Anyone hearing the discussion and the topics saying to
22
23
     themselves, you know, this doesn't feel like the right kind of
     case for me? Anyone feeling that in any way? Yes.
24
    Ms. Shattuck?
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Well, I do just to the
extent that I'm concerned that I may not understand all the
discussion in the courtroom.
         MR. BICKS: What kind of is on your mind on that
topic?
       Is there something that you're hearing and you're
saying that kind of unsettles you a little bit?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: I have failed to
understand a lot about computers for a pretty long time, so I'm
used to it, but it, you know -- I don't -- you know, you just
don't feel comfortable when you don't understand what's going
     I think it's that simple.
         MR. BICKS: And, Ms. Brown, did you -- I
couldn't . . .
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: I have little knowledge
about computers. But most of it I don't understand.
don't understand much about the Oracle or Google. And I
believe this is not the right case for me, although I
understand some of the English conversation that we have here.
But I don't know what it is really all about.
         MR. BICKS:
                     Thank you.
     Let me say it kind of the other way, which is anyone
listening to this discussion and saying Wow, I really want to
be on this case? This sounds like an exciting case and I'd
like to be on it?
     Why?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: I think it's fascinating.
 1
                                                                   Ιt
 2
     sounds --
              THE COURT:
                          You need to use the microphone, please.
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: I just think it's -- it's
 4
 5
     fascinating to see, you know, two very innovative companies
     sort of battle it out and fight over some of the things which,
 6
 7
     you know, you see happening in this Silicon Valley all the
     time.
 8
          And to be honest, I've also been on the patent side.
 9
     seen some of these things go, although I wasn't quite nearly as
10
11
     close as I am here.
12
              MR. BICKS: Yes.
13
          Mr. Kotlar, your thoughts.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Yes. It seems like an
14
15
     interesting case. The only thing I'd have to fight hard to is
16
    not to bust anything out to my wife. That would be hard to
17
    hold for five weeks, but I will do my best.
              MR. BICKS: I'm sorry. Say it again.
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: You know. To not -- not to
19
     inadvertently say something to my wife that I, you know -- when
20
     you're married, you know, it's hard to not say anything, but,
21
     you know, I'll do my best.
22
23
              THE COURT: You can say that you're on the case.
     That's it.
24
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: My wife is more tech savvy
```

than me. 1 THE COURT: No pillow talk about the case. All right. 2 Now, somebody else raised their hand down here. 3 Ms. Rocha. 4 5 You're down to five minutes to go. Thank you, Your Honor. MR. BICKS: 6 7 THE COURT: She raised her hand about wanting to be on the case. 8 MR. BICKS: 9 Yes. PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: Well, I didn't know what it 10 11 was going to be about until I got here, and it sounded very intriguing and it sounded like I could learn a lot from it. 12 MR. BICKS: And what --13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: Interesting. 14 MR. BICKS: When you say you think you might learn a 15 16 lot --PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: You know, in faces, new 17 people, new opportunity. 18 19 MR. BICKS: Thank you. Anyone else have any kind of thinking wow, this would be a 20 good case to be on? 21 22 THE COURT: Ms. Hines is raising her hand. 23 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES:** Same kind of response. really interesting subject matter. Something way outside of 24 25 the field that I typically work on. And obviously we all know

Oracle and Google, so kind of to hear more about what the actual company does and specifically a topic like this would just be a really interesting thing to be a part of.

MR. BICKS: So one of our former jurors mentioned something involved PeopleSoft. Anyone, in hearing that, think that's -- kind of at least give a negative feeling about Oracle based on that comment that was made by one of our former jurors here? Anyone hear that and say, you know, that makes me lean for or against Oracle?

So this will be the last time, you know, that I will be able to ask any of you questions. So my final wrap-up is anything that if you were sitting over there and standing where I am with my colleagues here and representatives from Oracle that you think we should know that might be important in indicating you may have -- this may not be the right case or you may have kind of a leaning against Oracle? Anything that I haven't covered with you on that? It's kind of now or, as they say, forever hold your peace. Anything that comes up that people think that we should share and talk about?

Final thing. I said that was the final, but lawyers are never -- many of you indicated that you've got Android products. Any concerns when you hear about what's at stake here that, as the judge mentioned -- as people who have Android products, is it on anybody's mind that that might impact something that you like, you use, in a way that could be

```
something that would be of concern to the Oracle side?
 1
                                                             Anyone?
 2
     Okay.
          So thank you for your time.
 3
          And, Your Honor, thank you for the chance to do this.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Bicks.
          We will take a break in a moment, but before we do it, on
 6
     the first day -- this is the first day -- we will not finish by
 7
     1:00 today. I had said earlier we will finish by 1:00.
 8
     once we get going with the evidence, but I'm pretty sure we're
 9
     not going to have the jury selected by 1:00 today, but maybe by
10
11
     2:00 or 2:30 we will be done for today, would be my guess.
     might have misled you about the 1:00 thing. That doesn't apply
12
     for today. So that's number one.
13
          And number two, way back at the first of Mr. Bicks'
14
15
     questions, he made -- it was a little unclear the difference
16
    between Orrick and Oracle. So let's be very clear about it.
     The law firm is the Orrick -- say the full name of the law
17
     firm.
18
                          Oracle, Herrington & Sutcliffe.
19
              MR. BICKS:
              THE COURT:
                         Any of you ever heard of that law firm or
20
21
     done business with that law firm? Okay. Good.
          How about -- and then Oracle, of course you know that
22
```

we -- if you have any connection to the Oracle, we need to know

PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: I think we own stock in both

about it. Do any of you own stock in the company?

23

24

companies, actually, in our portfolio. But my husband manages 1 it so I'm not even sure. 2 THE COURT: That could be a problem. I mean, here you 3 would be sitting on a jury where the value of your own 4 5 portfolio could go up or down, depending on how your verdict was. Can you find out during the break whether you own stock 6 in either of these companies? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: sure. 8 THE COURT: All right. Anyone else? Anyone else own 9 stock in one of these companies? Okay. Let's go to 10 11 Mr. Stromsness. PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Just index funds so --12 Those don't count, I don't think. You 13 THE COURT: could tell us about it, but I'm talking about direct ownership. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: My husband may or may not 15 16 own stock. 17 THE COURT: Can you find out during the break? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Sure. 18 THE COURT: Anyone else? And here is another thing. 19 It should go without saying, but you've got to appreciate this. 20 No one who is on the jury can trade in these two companies' 21 22 stock while the case is under way. That would be called 23 insider trading. And there are big penalties under the Title

18 of the United States Code for that. No insider -- I know

you wouldn't do it, but it's my duty to tell you.

24

If you were to buy or sell the stock in one of these two companies while the case was pending, it would be such a mess. We can't -- so you know you just can't do that. Do you understand that part? You got it? Okay. Good.

While we're on the break, I want -- we're going to come back and hear from the Google lawyer and ask you some questions, too.

I want you to be thinking about is there anything by way of full disclosure you should bring up and let us know about. I will just give you what sometimes happens. After the case is over and somebody loses, because somebody is going to lose in this case; right? Somebody is going to win. Once the case is over -- not this case, but I've had it in other cases. It might happen in this case. Whoever loses -- whoever wins is happy. They don't look at -- but whoever loses finds out maybe that a member of the jury failed to disclose something. So they then bring a motion saying, Judge, you got to set aside that verdict because juror number X did not tell us that they had something going or whatever it is. And if we had known that, we would have challenged that juror.

So it's impossible for us, no matter how good the lawyers are, how much I ask -- it's impossible for me to get in everything. So you need to be thinking is there anything you think, just out of caution, you ought to disclose to us so that we can let the lawyers take that into account. And they've got

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
to go from 16 of you down to 10. So they will stand up in due
course and -- each side gets three. So they will exercise
their challenges based upon what you've told them. And so they
need to know if there is anything more there. Be thinking
about it, would you, please. I would appreciate it.
    All right. We are going to take another break for 15
minutes. Please remember the admonition. Don't talk about the
case. But those of you who are supposed to call your spouses
and find out about stocks, you've got to do that, please.
Thank you.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: I have a question.
Having stock in either company automatically excuse us?
         THE COURT:
                    What?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: Having stock in either
company --
         THE COURT: You do?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: I do have in Google.
         THE COURT: Hang on a minute. Stay here.
    Have all prospective members of the jury left now except
for you?
    Okay. Anyone else who is a prospective member of the
jury, please raise your hand. Okay. You're leaving. Anyone
else? All right. Everyone else be seated.
    And your name, sir?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: Hamid Hosseinian.
```

```
Say again, please.
 1
              THE COURT:
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: H-A-M-I-D.
 2
    H-O-S-S-E-I-N-I-A-N.
 3
              THE COURT: You're telling us that you own stock in
 4
 5
     one of these companies?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: I bought four Google
 6
     stock long time ago. They split. Now it is eight, and I'm
 7
    not -- I have left it for the retirement.
 8
              THE COURT: But you own it now?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: I own it.
10
11
              THE COURT: Common stock in Google?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: Common stock of the
12
13
     Google.
              THE COURT: Anyone want to ask him any questions?
14
15
              MR. VAN NEST: No, Your Honor.
16
              MR. BICKS:
                          No.
17
              THE COURT: All right. You go take your 15-minute
     break, and I will give you the answer when we come back. All
18
19
     right?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: Okay. Thank you.
              THE COURT: I need one of my law clerks to right that
21
     name down.
                 Okay.
22
23
          I want to make sure, is there anyone else in the courtroom
     who is a prospective juror? No one. All right. Okay.
24
25
          So can we all agree that he should be excused?
```

```
MR. BICKS:
 1
                          Yes.
 2
              MR. VAN NEST: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: All right.
                                      Thank.
 3
          Now, what do you want to do -- any suggestions on excusing
 4
 5
     anybody?
              MR. VAN NEST: I do, Your Honor.
 6
                         Please. Let's hear it.
 7
              THE COURT:
              MR. VAN NEST: I think Mr. West has said he just
 8
     doesn't believe in free software. It should always be paid
 9
     for. We're going to have a ton of testimony about open source
10
11
     and obviously --
              THE COURT: I'm not going to do it yet. You're going
12
     to have to -- that's not -- the record is not good enough,
13
     unless you want to stipulate. All right. I'm not going to --
14
15
     you could ask him questions. Maybe it will come out that there
16
     is a good enough record, but so far it's not good enough.
17
          Anyone else?
              MR. VAN NEST: I have concern about Ms. Shattuck, who
18
19
     said several times she can't really follow what's going on with
20
     computers and doesn't understand it, and we're going to have a
     long trial with a lot of detail.
21
22
              THE COURT: All right. I have that same concern and
23
     also that same concern about Mrs. Brown.
              MR. VAN NEST: And me as well.
24
25
              THE COURT: My suggestion to both of you is you excuse
```

```
both of them.
                    I'm not going to do it unless you both agree.
 1
 2
              MR. VAN NEST: We would agree.
              MR. BICKS:
                          Is that something, Your Honor, I could
 3
     speak with my folks about?
 4
 5
              THE COURT:
                          Of course. You can speak with them.
                                                                Мy
     experience in these cases has been that the people who know the
 6
     most on the jury and the best able to serve you will knock them
 7
     off. I promise you, that's what going to happen.
 8
          And all you members of the public out there, watch to see
 9
     that the people who get knocked off the jury are the ones who
10
11
     could understand the best.
          But so, Mr. Bicks, if you want to keep these two on the
12
     jury, go ahead. But at least I'm not going to knock them off
13
     without -- there is not cause yet to knock them off, but you go
14
            Here, I will sit right here until you make your mind
15
     ahead.
16
     up.
              MR. BICKS: Really what's going through my mind,
17
     Your Honor, is Ms. Shattuck, for example, a lot of people can
18
     get intimidated hearing about this, but as I was speaking with
19
     her, she is clearly very capable --
20
              THE COURT: You don't have to -- look, I'm not going
21
     to argue with you. You two decide what you want to do.
22
                 (Plaintiff's counsel confer off the record.)
23
              MR. BICKS: So my thinking, Your Honor, would be with
24
    Ms. Brown, you know, we would stipulate to that, but maybe we
25
```

```
hear a little bit more on Ms. Shattuck.
 1
              THE COURT: All right. We will excuse Ms. Brown so
 2
     I'm not going to rule Ms. Shattuck out. There is not cause to
 3
     rule her out, but to my mind, it's pretty clear she is not
 4
 5
     going to understand the evidence and -- but that's not grounds
     to knock somebody off, at least on this record.
 6
 7
          So we'll excuse Ms. Brown. And I said, I was not going to
     excuse Mr. West yet. All right.
 8
          Anybody you want to have a discussion about?
 9
                          I think I just should raise something that
10
              MR. BICKS:
11
     was brought to my attention about Mr. Kotlar.
              THE COURT:
12
                          Yes?
              MR. BICKS: And I don't know if this is accurate.
13
     Someone suggested to me he was handing something to one of the
14
15
     jurors who had been dismissed out in the hallway. I don't know
16
     anything more than that.
17
              THE COURT:
                         What? Somebody told you that he did that?
              MR. BICKS:
                         Yeah.
18
                         What was he handing?
19
              THE COURT:
              MR. BICKS: I don't know, Your Honor. Pamphlet or
20
     something. I don't know. Just because it was reported to me I
21
22
     thought I would relay it.
              THE COURT: It might be one of these biblical things.
23
```

Who knows? He seems like he is a very religious quy.

Do you want me to ask him if he did that?

24

```
Can I chat about that, Judge? I think we
 1
              MR. BICKS:
 2
    probably should.
              THE COURT:
                               I'm happy to ask. So somebody who
                         No.
 3
     was dismissed?
 4
 5
              MR. BICKS:
                          Yes.
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. By the way, the two people who
 6
     asked that I -- that I sent to the back of the room, you're
 7
     free to look at these as well.
 8
          Angie, would you hand these to counsel.
 9
          You can verify that I did it the right way.
10
11
              MR. BICKS:
                          Thank you.
              THE COURT: Why don't you do that right now.
12
              MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, could I raise one other
13
    point?
14
15
              THE COURT:
                         You can. But look at these two. Look at
     it and see Question 9. They were not excused. They were just
16
17
     sent to the back of the room. Okay. Are we good?
              MR. VAN NEST: I'm sorry. Is the question whether --
18
              THE COURT:
                          The question is did I do it right?
19
20
              MR. BICKS:
                          Yes.
              MR. VAN NEST: Yes, you did it right.
21
              THE COURT:
                          Then just hand them back. All right.
22
    Good.
23
          Now, what else did you want to raise?
24
25
              MR. VAN NEST: I want to raise -- and Ms. Harper has
```

```
on her -- Juror No. 9, she -- her brother is working at Oracle.

She answered yes actually to the question, "Have you or a loved one within the past ten years been employed by" --

THE COURT: Yes.
```

MR. VAN NEST: -- "owned stock." Her brother works at Oracle. I think it sounded like, from what she said, he has worked there twice. Maybe once and come back. She says her husband may own stock in Google. She is going to check on that. I would think if she has any sort of relationship with her brother and he is working at Oracle and programming, that would be a reason to excuse --

THE COURT: Not necessarily. She said flat out it would not influence her. I had invited you two to stipulate to automatic exclusion for answers like that and you wouldn't do it. You said you had to get more details.

MR. VAN NEST: We didn't say that. I was willing to stipulate to that and thought we should, actually, on it.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to excuse her based on the fact that her brother works at one of the companies. I think she was asked -- now, you can follow up and ask her questions and find out if she would be biased and maybe she is going to turn out to own stock anyway. That would be a deal-killer right there.

MR. VAN NEST: Right. Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: But, yeah -- all right. Anything else?

```
1
              MR. BICKS:
                          No, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: We'll take about a ten-minute break.
 2
     Thank you.
 3
                       (Recess taken at 12:04 p.m.)
 4
 5
                   (Proceedings resumed at 12:15 p.m.)
              THE COURT: All right. Be seated, please.
 6
 7
          Mr. Hamid, Hosseinian, where are you?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: Here.
 8
 9
              THE COURT: Yes. We've agreed to excuse you.
     back to the jury assembly room and tell them what happened,
10
11
     okay.
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: Okay.
13
              THE COURT: Would you give us your questionnaire
     though.
14
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HOSSEINIAN: Thank you.
16
              THE COURT: You're most welcome.
17
          Let's follow up. Ms. Harper, did you get any info?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: I was not able to reach my
18
19
              I left a message.
20
              THE COURT: Well, the thing is, we can't have somebody
     on the jury who owns stock in the company. Or their spouse
21
     does.
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: I understand.
23
              THE COURT: Or, for that matter, if you have a
24
25
     partner, same thing.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
We've got to have people in here who have no source of
bias, okay. So you've got to find out the answer.
     What makes you think that your husband might own stock?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Well, he has a small stock
account separate from mine. So he's constantly buying and
selling. So I did put it on my questionnaire that he might own
stock in Google initially. And I'm just not sure if he still
holds stock in Google or in Oracle.
         THE COURT: One thing you've got to tell your spouses
and partners while the case is going on, no buying and selling
stock in either of these two companies. That much you have to
tell them.
     Who else was going to check?
     Ms. Jacobs.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: We had Google. And it was
sold last year. My husband owns ten shares, worth $417, of
Oracle in his IRA.
         THE COURT:
                    Right now?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS:
                                   Yes.
         THE COURT: Don't we have to excuse Ms. Jacobs?
Agreed?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: It's a small percentage of
his portfolio.
```

THE COURT: Listen -- yes, Mr. Bicks.

MR. BICKS: This is an individual stock? Or, like, an

```
index or --
 1
              THE COURT: It's stock directly in Oracle, but it's
 2
     owned in his retirement account.
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR JACOBS: Correct.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: So it's not an index fund. It's direct
     ownership. Agreed?
 6
              MR. BICKS:
 7
                         Yes.
              THE COURT: Okay. You would be a great juror,
 8
    Ms. Jacobs, but we've got to do it. We can't let you serve.
 9
          All right. I'm sorry. I should have brought this up
10
11
     sooner.
          Okay. Let's call a name to replace Ms. Jacobs.
12
                          Jennifer Yasumoto, Y-a-s-u-m-o-t-o.
13
              THE CLERK:
14
              THE COURT:
                         Yasumoto. All right. Please let me see
15
     your questionnaire.
16
          Great. Please have that seat over there. While you're
17
     doing that...
          Mr. Kotlar, can I ask you a question?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Yes, sir.
19
              THE COURT: Someone -- I won't say who -- observed the
20
21
     possibility that you gave some document to one of the jurors,
22
    potential jurors who were dismissed, out in the hallway.
23
          Did they see the right thing, or is that mistaken?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Uhm -- oh, you mean the,
24
25
     uhm, one of the jurors in the box here?
```

```
Yes, sir.
 1
              THE COURT:
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Yes, sir.
              THE COURT: What happened?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: That's not mistaken.
 4
 5
              THE COURT: What were you giving them?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: I can give you a copy if
 6
 7
     you wish.
              THE COURT: What is it?
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: It's a pamphlet related to
 9
     my church, and has some verses from the Word of God on it.
10
11
              THE COURT: All right.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: And it seemed, like,
12
13
     appropriate because she's possibly mourning the loss, and Jesus
     is the hope that she needs.
14
              THE COURT: All right. Now, let me tell you
15
     something. That's grand. That's fine. But you can't be
16
    proselytizing your religion among the jury. Do you understand
17
18
     that?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: I cannot say I will keep
19
     that. I serve a higher authority than you are, sir.
20
21
              THE COURT: Well --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: And there is a judge that
22
23
     is higher than you, that we have to come to.
              THE COURT: I accept that. But so far he has not
24
     communicated to me.
25
```

```
(Laughter)
 1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: He has left his
 2
     communication for everybody to read. You just have to open it
 3
 4
     up.
 5
              THE COURT: I'm going with what's been communicated to
         And you can't be intimidating the rest of the members of
 6
     the jury with your religion.
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: I don't try to intimidate.
 8
    But I cannot keep what you say.
 9
              THE COURT: Fine. You sit there for a minute and I'll
10
11
     take it up with the lawyers. We'll see if that's a problem,
12
     okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR:
13
                                         Okay.
              THE COURT: All right. What is your religion, anyway?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: I am a born again
15
16
     Christian. Jesus is my savior. I am a Baptist by church
17
     authority. But Jesus is the only savior.
18
              THE COURT: All right.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: And that we have to claim.
19
20
              THE COURT:
                          I got it.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: People trust in many
21
     different kinds, but he's the only one.
22
23
              THE COURT: Okay. I got it.
24
          Thank you.
          Now, Ms. -- I've got to change subjects. Ms. Brown.
25
```

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: Yes. THE COURT: Because of the reservations you expressed 2 about understanding the case, the lawyers want to excuse you. 3 Both agree. Both sides agree. So you're excused. 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: Thank you. **THE COURT:** So you may go back to the jury assembly 6 7 room and tell them what happened. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BROWN: Yes, sir. 8 THE COURT: And we will now replace Mrs. Brown. 9 Okay. Victoria Davis. D-a-v-i-s. 10 THE CLERK: 11 THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Davis. No, it's good afternoon. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: 13 Yes. 14 **THE COURT:** How are you today? PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Cool. 15 16 THE COURT: You're good. It's a little cold in here. 17 We have to keep it a little cold in here because there's so 18 many people, and you get sleepy if I don't keep it cold. 19 (Laughter) THE COURT: So good for you. All right. 20 You get to sit in Mrs. Brown's spot. Thank you. 21 Okay. Can I see counsel at the sidebar for one moment. 22 23 (The following proceedings were heard at the sidebar:) THE COURT: Okay. I believe we should excuse 24 25 Mr. Kotlar, but I don't want to do that without a stipulation.

```
1
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             So stipulated.
 2
              MR. BICKS:
                          Agreed.
              THE COURT: So I'm going to excuse him right now.
 3
 4
     Thank you.
 5
              MR. VAN NEST: Thank you.
          (Sidebar concluded.)
 6
              THE COURT: Mr. Kotlar, based on your religious
 7
     beliefs that there's higher authority than I am -- which is
 8
     fine in some respects, but in this courtroom I've got to be the
 9
     highest authority.
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: I understand.
11
              THE COURT: So you're excused. Please go back to the
12
13
     jury assembly room and tell them what happened. All right.
     Good luck to you, sir.
14
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Before I leave, can I give
16
     you a copy of that?
17
              THE COURT:
                         No.
                               It would be wasted.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KOTLAR: Yes, sir.
18
              THE COURT:
19
                          Thank you.
          Next, let's replace Mr. Kotlar.
20
21
              THE CLERK:
                         Wendy Huynh. H-u-y-n-h.
22
              THE COURT:
                         H-u-y-n- --
23
              THE CLERK:
                          -- h.
              THE COURT: -- h.
24
25
          How do you say your last name?
```

```
1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
                                        Huynh.
              THE COURT: Ms. Huynh, please take that empty seat.
 2
     All right.
 3
          Let's start with you, Ms. Davis. We've got two new
 4
 5
              I have forgotten how many. Two new people.
     people.
 6
     three. We've got Ms. Yasumoto; right.
          Pass the mic to Ms. Yasumoto first.
 7
          Ms. Yasumoto, do you have any hardship issue.
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO:
 9
              THE COURT: Can you see the chart?
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO:
11
              THE COURT: Can give us the information.
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Jennifer Yasumoto.
13
     El Cerrito.
14
          Graduate school, law school.
15
16
          Current job is Chief Deputy County Counsel in Napa County.
17
     I'm not a member of any organizations or clubs.
              THE COURT: A little closer to the microphone please.
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Hobbies, cooking, baking,
19
     crafting, piano playing.
20
21
          I am married. My spouse is a psychologist.
          We have no children.
22
23
          I did serve on a jury about three years ago.
     civil. We reached a verdict. I was the foreperson.
24
25
     military or law enforcement.
```

1	Never a party or witness in court.
2	THE COURT: So you're a lawyer?
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Correct.
4	THE COURT: Practicing?
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Correct.
6	THE COURT: And your client is the County of Napa
7	County?
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Correct.
9	THE COURT: Do you do litigation? What kind of work
10	do you do?
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: I do employment. And I
12	represent most relative to human services agencies.
13	THE COURT: Is there anything about the work you do
14	that bears on the kind of case we've got here?
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: I don't think so.
16	THE COURT: All right. Have you heard all of the
17	questions so far?
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Yes.
19	THE COURT: Would you have raised your hand to any of
20	those questions?
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: No.
22	THE COURT: Can you be a fair and impartial juror?
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Would you follow the instructions I give
25	you?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: 1 Yes. THE COURT: Would you do that thing about laying the 2 evidence alongside the items of proof that have to be proven 3 and then do that fair and square? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: THE COURT: All right. Great. Please pass the 6 7 microphone to Mrs. Davis. Ms. Davis, do you have a hardship issue? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: 9 THE COURT: Can you see the chart okay? 10 11 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS:** (Nods head.) THE COURT: Please give us the info. 12 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: My name is Victoria Davis. I live in Berkeley. 14 15 I have a bachelor's in English literature. 16 I'm retired. My most recent job was as a medical 17 transcriptionist and working in medical records. 18 I belong to the Stewards of the Coast and Redwoods. My hobbies is reading, and more reading, walking, 19 20 bicycling. 21 I'm divorced, but I've been living with a partner for 10, 12 years. 22 23 I have one living child. I had a daughter die a couple of years ago. He's 29. He is a production engineer, I think in, 24 a netcasting, podcasting, netcasting, something like that. 25

```
It's called TWIT. This Week in Technology. That's all
 1
     TWIT.
 2
     I know.
          I have had prior -- I've had four prior jury services, but
 3
     two of them were several -- many, many years ago in another
 4
 5
     state.
          Two in California. One was criminal. One was civil.
                                                                 The
 6
 7
     criminal was 15 or more years ago in Sonoma County. And we
     reached a verdict. And the civil was just three or four years
 8
     ago in Oakland. And we reached a verdict. Although, that one
 9
     was difficult. That took us a long time.
10
11
          No military, law enforcement.
          And I've never been a party or a witness in court.
12
13
              THE COURT: Did you hear all the questions that were
     asked earlier?
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: No problem.
15
16
              THE COURT: The questions I asked and the questions
17
     that Mr. Bicks asked, would you have raised your hand to any of
18
     those?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS:
19
                                       No.
              THE COURT: Let me ask, how about this, do you have an
20
    Android telephone?
21
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: No. I've had iPhones all
23
     alonq.
                          IPhones, okay. All right. Do you own
24
              THE COURT:
25
     stock in either of these two companies? Or your partner?
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: 1 2 THE COURT: I forgot, Ms. Yasumoto, do you or your husband own any stock in one of these companies? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: I mean, I don't. And I'm --I think that my partner's stock is -- is all in biotech. 6 7 got -- I tried to call him, but he's playing golf. So I can't possibly reach him. But he changed everything to mutual funds 8 and biotech, as far as I know. He keeps pretty up with me on 9 what he's got. 10 And I know that he's not at all interested in -- in 11 technology. I've never heard him ever talk about how Google is 12 13 going, or Oracle. So he would talk about it because he talks 14 about everything else. 15 (Laughter) 16 **THE COURT:** Okay. So. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: I can't say for a hundred percent sure, but I think I would know because I know how all 18 19 the other stocks are doing. 20 Okay. All right. Let's please pass the THE COURT: 21 mic to Ms. Huynh. 22 Ms. Huynh, do you have any hardship issue? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: 23 24 THE COURT: You can you see the poster. PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: 25 Yes.

```
Please give us the info.
 1
              THE COURT:
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: My name is Wendy Huynh.
 2
     live in Hercules.
 3
          I have a bachelor of science in biological sciences from
 4
 5
     UC Davis.
          I currently work at Biomarin Pharmaceutical in Novato.
 6
          I'm not affiliated with any organizations.
 7
          Hobbies are running, reading. I am not married, but I am
 8
 9
     engaged.
          Uhm, my fiance works as a technical specialist at Biomarin
10
11
     also.
          I don't have any children.
12
13
          No prior jury service.
          Never been in the military.
14
          Or have never been a witness in court.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. Do you have an Android phone?
16
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: I have an iPhone.
              THE COURT: Have you ever had one in the past?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
19
                                        No.
              THE COURT: Do you think you're biased slightly one
20
     way or the other in this case?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
22
                                        No.
23
              THE COURT: Can you be fair and impartial to both
     sides?
24
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
                                         Yes.
```

```
THE COURT:
 1
                          Will you?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
 2
                                       Yes.
              THE COURT: And will you follow my instructions as to
 3
     the law?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
                                        Yes.
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 6
 7
          Anyone, before we continue with the next lawyer, did you
     think of anything that you want to disclose?
 8
          Okay. Ms. Harper. Let's take the microphone back to
 9
    Ms. Harper.
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: With no disrespect
11
     intended, Your Honor, I did leave my phone on so I could
12
     receive a text regarding the stock.
13
              THE COURT: Yeah.
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: And my husband says he has
15
16
    holdings in a mutual fund that holds Google, but that's all.
17
              THE COURT: All right. Counsel, I don't think that's
     a problem. But do any of you think it's a problem?
18
              MR. VAN NEST: No, Your Honor. It's a mutual fund.
19
              MR. BICKS: My question would just be would it have an
20
21
     impact?
22
              THE COURT: Here, why don't you ask a few questions.
23
     I'll give you a little extra time. Go ahead, ask the
     questions.
24
25
              MR. BICKS: Any -- appreciate --
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: It has no impact for me.
 1
              MR. BICKS: Because people -- if you have a mutual
 2
     fund, people think -- you know, that can be concerned about
 3
            But from your perspective you're okay?
 4
 5
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER:
                                         Yes.
              MR. BICKS: Thank you.
 6
 7
              THE COURT:
                         So you've got a brother that works for one
     side; right?
 8
 9
           (Laughter)
              THE COURT: And you've got a husband that owns a
10
11
    mutual fund that has stock in Google; right?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Correct.
12
13
              THE COURT: But none of that is going to matter to
14
     you; correct?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER:
15
                                         No.
16
              THE COURT: Wait. See, I had a bad question. Will it
17
    matter to you?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER:
                                         No.
              THE COURT: All right. That's what I meant to ask.
19
20
    All right. Great.
21
          Anyone else have a full disclosure point? Ms. Rocha, we
22
     need to get you the microphone.
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: When you mentioned
     PeopleSoft, I did work for PeopleSoft, through a temp agency,
24
25
     for two months about 20 years ago.
```

That was before Oracle was on the scene; 1 THE COURT: 2 correct? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: Yes, yes. 3 THE COURT: Will that have anything to do with how 4 5 good a juror you are? PROSPECTIVE JUROR ROCHA: 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anyone else? That's a good point to bring up though. 8 That's exactly the kind of point that should be disclosed. 9 Anyone else? Great. 10 11 So I'm going to -- Mr. Bicks, we've got three new people on the panel. So I'm going to give you extra time, but not 12 13 yet. Let's let Mr. Van Nest ask his questions, and then we'll 14 15 come back to you and give you some more time. 16 MR. VAN NEST: Thank you. Thank you, Your Honor. Good afternoon everyone. My name is Bob Van Nest. I'm at 17 Keker & Van Nest, here in San Francisco, and very proud to be 18 here representing Google. 19 I'd like to reintroduce my team as well, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Do so. 21 MR. VAN NEST: Our client representative from Google 22 23 is Catherine Lacavera. And with me Christa Anderson, Dan Purcell, Matthias 24 25 Kamber, Michael Kwun, Mike Tiktinsky. And that's our team.

Do any of you know any of those folks, me, or anyone else? 1 2 Very good. Thank you. And I want to start by thanking you for your service as 3 jurors. As you've heard a couple of times, it's a very 4 5 important case for both parties. And I really appreciate the candor you've shown on the questionnaires and in the answers. 6 7 And I'm going to keep at it for a little while. you. 8 Ms. Kreslake. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Yes. 10 11 MR. VAN NEST: Good afternoon. You mentioned that you've got a neighbor and your best 12 friend that both work at Oracle. 13 THE COURT: Pass the mic down there, please. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: The nextdoor neighbor 15 16 currently works at Oracle. My closest friend, she no long 17 works with Oracle. And she's moved out of state. MR. VAN NEST: How long ago did your closest friend 18 19 move away? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: She moved away a year ago. And she departed Oracle, probably, 18 months ago. 21 22 MR. VAN NEST: Okay. Did you and she talk together a 23 lot about Oracle or about her work? Was that a common source of discussion? 24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Yes, because she worked

```
at several places. And, yes, she would talk about her work
 1
     with me.
 2
              MR. VAN NEST: How often would the two of you talk?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: We saw each other once a
 4
 5
     week.
              MR. VAN NEST: What area of Oracle was she working in?
 6
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: She was in human
 7
 8
     resources.
              MR. VAN NEST: Here in Redwood Shores?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE:
10
              MR. VAN NEST: I take it she shared her views of
11
     Oracle, and was happy to work there?
12
13
           (Laughter)
              MR. VAN NEST: Let me ask another question. Let's
14
15
     talk about your neighbor.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Yes.
              MR. VAN NEST: The neighbor who works there at Oracle
17
         How often do you talk with him or her?
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Quite a bit, but never
19
     about his work, other than I know he's in cloud computing.
20
21
              MR. VAN NEST: Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: But he doesn't speak to
22
    me about details of his work.
23
              MR. VAN NEST: And he works here at Redwood Shores as
24
     well?
25
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: 1 Yes. MR. VAN NEST: Your neighbor, are you close friends, 2 good friends, good neighbors? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Good neighbors. 4 5 MR. VAN NEST: Good neighbors. But the two of you haven't talked about work? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: 7 MR. VAN NEST: So, Ms. Kreslake, my question is, would 8 your relationship with either your best friend or your current 9 neighbor, does that have any -- will that cause you to put 10 11 Oracle a little bit ahead as we start this case where they're the plaintiff suing Google? 12 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: No, because we live in San Carlos. All of our neighbors work for some tech firm. 14 15 Some Google, some -- you know, I'm not privy to everybody's 16 job. But I hear a lot of talk about tech companies because I'm 17 in that neighborhood. San Carlos is full of it. But as far as my closest friend, I agreed with some of her 18 opinions. And I didn't agree with others. And, you know, I 19 mean, it was just -- no, I don't think it would bias me one way 20 or another. 21 MR. VAN NEST: Would it cause you to think more 22 23 favorably about Oracle vis-a-vis Google --PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: No. 24 25 MR. VAN NEST: -- without having heard any evidence?

```
1
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: No, huh-uh.
 2
              MR. VAN NEST: Thank you, Ms. Kreslake.
          One thing we didn't find out. Do you have a smartphone?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: I have an old-fashioned,
 4
 5
    basic cell phone because we have a tablet.
              MR. VAN NEST: And your tablet is?
 6
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Samsung Galaxy.
              MR. VAN NEST: Galaxy. So you have a Samsung Galaxy
 8
     tablet?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE:
10
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Have you had any problems
    with that?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: No.
13
              MR. VAN NEST: Happy with it.
14
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Uh-huh.
15
16
              MR. VAN NEST: Thank you very much.
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR KRESLAKE: Okay.
              MR. VAN NEST: Ms. Harper, good afternoon. I know
18
     we've had a number of questions for you.
19
          Your brother works at Oracle.
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Yes.
21
              MR. VAN NEST: Did he work there before as well?
22
23
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: My understanding is he's
     worked there previously, yes.
24
25
              MR. VAN NEST: And do you know how long he was an
```

Oracle employee the first time? 1 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER:** I few years, I believe. 2 Ιt gets a little murky. I don't understand everything that he 3 does. And sometimes he's worked independently and contracted 4 5 for some of the software companies. So --MR. VAN NEST: Is he a programmer? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: 7 MR. VAN NEST: And he's just now recently returned to 8 Oracle? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Correct. 10 11 MR. VAN NEST: Do you see your brother frequently? Infrequently? How often do you two talk? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: About three or four times a 13 14 year. MR. VAN NEST: So not a lot? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR MS. HARPER: No. 17 MR. VAN NEST: Have you ever talked about work? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: Like I said, I don't 18 understand everything he does. So a lot of it (indicating). 19 20 MR. VAN NEST: Very good. And, again, the fact that he's now back at Oracle, would 21 22 that have any impact on your thinking about this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: No. 23 MR. VAN NEST: Would it give Oracle an advantage even 24 25 before the first witness shows up?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: 1 No. MR. VAN NEST: And it's not something that you're 2 worried about in terms of your ability to be fair and 3 impartial? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HARPER: No. I've not heard anything about the case from him, or read anything in the news 6 7 or anything like that. So currently I have no opinion. MR. VAN NEST: Thank you. 8 Ms. Shattuck, good afternoon. 9 You said a couple of times that you -- you have concerns 10 11 about computers because sometimes the language we're using is confusing. 12 Can you elaborate on that just a little bit for us. 13 you worried about being able to understand testimony about 14 15 computers? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Yes. 17 MR. VAN NEST: And why? PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Well, if you don't 18 19 understand the language, you're not going to understand what's 20 being talked about. 21 MR. VAN NEST: And when you -- do you have a computer 22 at home now? PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Yes, I do. 23 MR. VAN NEST: Do you have -- need help with that? 24 Do you ask your kids for help or your --25

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: My son lives in Chicago,
 1
 2
    but when he visits I always ask him for help.
              MR. VAN NEST: And are you concerned that technical
 3
     testimony about computers or the computer business will be
 4
 5
     difficult for you to follow?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Yes.
 6
 7
              MR. VAN NEST: Is this the kind of case, you think,
     that's maybe not cut out for you? Would you rather sit on a
 8
     different case?
 9
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Oh, what do you have in
10
    mind?
11
12
           (Laughter)
              MR. VAN NEST: Well said. Well said.
13
14
           (Laughter)
              MR. VAN NEST: I wish I were in charge. That's not
15
16
     the case. That's not the case.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: I don't -- you know, I
17
     don't -- I don't have a feeling one way or the other --
18
19
              MR. VAN NEST: Okay.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: -- about that.
20
21
              MR. VAN NEST: Thank you. Thank you.
          One other question I had for you. You mentioned that --
22
23
     are you -- were you active in your union when you were working?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Yes.
24
25
              MR. VAN NEST: What positions did you hold?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: I've been a shop steward for many years. I was president of my local for many years. I was a member of the statewide board for many years. MR. VAN NEST: And were those positions that you were appointed to or you were elected to? PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Elected. MR. VAN NEST: Elected to. Congratulations. PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Thank you. MR. VAN NEST: And I see you enjoyed that a lot. PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: I did. MR. VAN NEST: Are you retired from that now, as well? PROSPECTIVE JUROR SHATTUCK: Yes. MR. VAN NEST: Thank you. Thank you. Let's go right next door to Mr. West. Good afternoon, Mr. West. PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: How's it going? MR. VAN NEST: It's going well. I want to ask you your views on software. Tell me, again, I think you responded earlier that your view was that there's no such thing as open source software, or all software should be compensated. PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: Yeah. MR. VAN NEST: Tell us what you meant by that. PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: Basically, what I mean is it would go the same with any category, whether somebody has an

```
idea, an invention, or even an efficient process that they come
 1
     up with on their own should always be compensated for.
 2
     Especially if it's something that -- that you have help with by
 3
     a bigger corporation. Something like that. You would
 4
 5
     always -- it should always be compensated for. Nothing should
 6
     be really free for everybody to use.
             MR. VAN NEST: And is that a view that you have based
 7
     on your work or based on school or both?
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: A little bit of -- well,
 9
     mostly work. And then just the way I was brought up.
10
11
             MR. VAN NEST: What is it about work that's caused you
     to have those views?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: I'm just a tradesman in
13
     general. And I tend to work pretty hard. And I prefer to be
14
15
     well-compensated for the things that I do, especially if I come
16
     up with something that's a more efficient way of doing things.
17
     I would expect to be compensated for that.
             MR. VAN NEST: Now, have you ever heard of software
18
     called open source, that a bunch of companies work on together
19
20
     and give away for free? Is that something you're familiar
     with?
21
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:
                                       Not exactly. I mean, I've
23
    kind of heard of the open source concept, but not in detail.
              MR. VAN NEST: Okay. There will be some evidence,
24
```

some testimony about open source software and software that was

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

either free or not free. I take it you would come to that with, sort of, a previous position as to whether software can ever be free? PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: Yeah. MR. VAN NEST: And why do you think that? **PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:** Uhm, can you rephrase that? MR. VAN NEST: Let me put it this way: You have strong views about paying for software. Would it be difficult for you to put those views aside and listen to evidence about open source software and free software? PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: No. MR. VAN NEST: Some of the evidence will go to the issue of companies sharing software. PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: Uh-huh. MR. VAN NEST: Do you have any views about that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST: No. MR. VAN NEST: No? And do you think you could sit impartially in a situation where one party was claiming that the software was free and the other party was claiming that the software was only for sale? **PROSPECTIVE JUROR WEST:** Yeah, absolutely. MR. VAN NEST: All right. Thank you, Mr. West. Ms. Huynh. THE COURT: Just one second. All right. Thank you. Go ahead.

```
MR. VAN NEST: I'd like to ask Ms. -- Ms. Huynh, good
 1
     afternoon.
 2
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: Good afternoon.
 3
              MR. VAN NEST: You mentioned on your questionnaire
 4
 5
     that your father may own stock in Oracle or Google. Do you
     know that for a fact? Or that's something you think may be
 6
     true?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: I think may be true.
                                                              I know
 8
    he talks a lot about stocks, mentions Google and Oracle. But I
 9
     am not sure.
10
11
              MR. VAN NEST: And this is your father?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: Yes, my father.
12
13
              MR. VAN NEST: Do you live with your parents now?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: Yes, I live with them.
14
              MR. VAN NEST: Does your dad talk about stocks
15
16
     frequently?
17
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: He would just mention
     because he would watch, you know, the stocks on TV, and just
18
19
    mention, oh, stocks are going up or down. But I don't really
20
    pay attention.
21
              MR. VAN NEST: You don't follow it yourself?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
22
                                       No.
23
              MR. VAN NEST: This is something he talks about.
     this is his account, your parents' account, not your own
24
     account?
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: Yeah, not my account. MR. VAN NEST: Okay. Can you tell us a little bit what you do at Biomarin? You mentioned quality control. are you doing day by day? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: So I work in the quality control department in environmental monitoring group. And our group pretty much monitors the environment, the rooms and the water utility systems for the manufacturing facility at our And I -- my job is really writing up deviations or company. investigations on -- if we have any excursions over specification limits, then I write up the investigations for those. And just pretty much making sure that the lab runs smoothly, because I work in the lab as well. MR. VAN NEST: Thank you. The reports you're doing there for the company's benefit? You're reporting within the company --PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: Yes. MR. VAN NEST: -- on whether they are exceeding specifications, and that sort of thing? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: Yes. MR. VAN NEST: Do you have enforcement responsibility in that regard? Or you're simply making a report and passing it on? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: I'm just making the report. There's always an approver. My boss approves my investigations

```
before it's official.
 1
              MR. VAN NEST: And your background in school is in
 2
     pharmaceuticals?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: In biology.
 4
 5
              MR. VAN NEST: In biology. Thank you. Thank you
    Ms. Huynh.
 6
          Ms. Davis, one of our new arrivals.
 7
          Ms. Davis, you mentioned that you read a lot. Have you
 8
 9
    written anything?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Written?
10
11
              MR. VAN NEST: Have you written anything?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Written, no.
12
13
              MR. VAN NEST: You're not an author; you're a reader?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: I'm a reader.
14
              MR. VAN NEST: Do you think about -- this is a case
15
16
     about copyright. Is copyright something that you think about a
17
     lot, a little, or not much?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Uhm, the only way -- place
18
     I've been following it is with like eBooks.
19
20
              MR. VAN NEST: And what have you been following on
     eBooks?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Well, not too much.
22
     even clear how I feel about it, you know, eBooks versus real
23
    books. I like real books.
24
              MR. VAN NEST: You like to hold --
25
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: On the other hand, I have a
 1
     Kindle.
 2
           (Laughter)
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: And that's not really a
 4
 5
     copyright issue, I think. That's a whole different issue.
    no, I don't -- I don't actually know too much about copyright.
 6
 7
              MR. VAN NEST: Okay. And you mentioned you have
     always had an iPhone, not an Android.
 8
 9
          Do you have anything against an Android, or simply chose
     an iPhone?
10
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: No, I just had iPhone from
     the beginning. I have a Mac. And, you know, I just sort of
12
13
     drank the Kool-Aid, and I have the whole system. And it's just
     easier to have everything all in one.
14
15
              MR. VAN NEST: Perfect.
16
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Because Android didn't have
17
     that in the beginning. You know, if you had -- if you had an
18
     Android phone and a Mac computer, you couldn't put all your
19
    photos.
20
              MR. VAN NEST: That's gotten a lot better. But not
21
    yet.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: I know. I've heard.
22
                                                              My son
23
     is a total Microsoft person, so --
              MR. VAN NEST: So he's into Windows.
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Yeah.
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
Let me ask, while we're talking about
         MR. VAN NEST:
copyrights, does anybody in our panel hold a copyright on
anything?
     Has anybody applied for a copyright?
     Does anybody have strong views about copyrights or
copyrightability?
     This is a case about copyrights. Both Oracle and Google
have a lot of copyrights. But in this particular case Oracle
has the copyrights and they're asserting them against Google.
     Is there anybody -- and I'll ask for a show of hands.
Does anybody feel that the owner of the copyright starts off
ahead in a copyright lawsuit that's disputed?
     Anybody feel that just because -- before there's any
evidence, just because Oracle holds the copyrights, they start
off a little bit ahead of Google, which is the defendant?
     How about patents -- oh, yes, sir, Mr. Stromsness.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I think the judge told
us earlier that if -- that it's already settled that the
copyright is held, and so the burden of evidence is with
Google.
         MR. VAN NEST: And let me ask about that. He did say
      And you were listening closely.
     Does that cause you to put one party ahead of the other at
the starting gate?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I'm not sure "ahead."
```

It's just who has to show whatever the burden is. 1 MR. VAN NEST: But in terms of -- we all know that 2 someone -- someone mentioned it's got to be proven, it's got to 3 be evidence. And that's certainly true, and you'll hear that a 4 5 number of times. In terms of where we stand now, before there's any 6 evidence, you would place the two parties on an equal footing? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Yes. 8 MR. VAN NEST: Is there anybody that feels different, 9 either because Oracle holds a copyright or because of anything 10 11 Judge Alsup said? Does anybody feel that the parties are not on an even 12 13 footing starting out, or that Google is behind? That's what I would really be concerned about --14 (Laughter) 15 16 MR. VAN NEST: Anybody put Google behind? 17 Okay. Good. Thank you. I appreciate that. Let's ask Mr. Bruesewitz. I just want to clarify what you 18 said about Mr. Ellison. Obviously, he's the CEO of Oracle. 19 He'll play a role in the case. 20 Is he someone you admire a lot? You mentioned Lanai and 21 golf and all that. Tell us about your views on Mr. Ellison. 22 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: Just especially in our

culture today, it's not, how would you say, normal for people

to actually look at someone and say, I want to be that.

24

```
it's like, I deserve that. So I consider him a pretty
 1
 2
     inspiring person.
              MR. VAN NEST: Okay.
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: The fact he's been able
 4
 5
     to do what he's been able to do.
              MR. VAN NEST: He's accomplished a lot. If I ask you,
 6
     do you admire Mr. Ellison, the answer would be?
 7
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: Yes.
 8
              MR. VAN NEST: Okay. And have you been following his
 9
     career in particular?
10
11
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: No, just Lanai.
12
           (Laughter)
13
              MR. VAN NEST: Just Lanai. That was a big one.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: Yeah. I played there
14
15
     twice, so I knew he bought it. I was hoping he would make the
16
     course a little nicer.
17
          (Laughter)
              MR. VAN NEST: How does that impact your thinking
18
19
    here?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: I don't see the
     relevance, myself.
21
22
              MR. VAN NEST: Would you be able to put that aside,
23
     and, again, put Google and Oracle on the same footing in the
24
     case?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: Of course.
25
```

Would your admiration come into play at 1 MR. VAN NEST: 2 all, even a little? PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: I don't see how it 3 could because I don't see him on a day-to-day basis kind of 4 5 I don't have a personal attachment to him. MR. VAN NEST: Is there anything else about the case 6 7 you've heard that causes you to question whether you would be impartial? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: I actually haven't 9 heard about the case, which I guess is shocking from what 10 11 everyone is saying. MR. VAN NEST: Good. You haven't heard or read 12 13 anything about the case, sounds like. PROSPECTIVE JUROR BRUESEWITZ: 14 MR. VAN NEST: All right. Let me ask a couple of 15 16 other questions, just general, for the group. 17 Most people raised their hands on Google products. Is there anybody on our panel that has never used a Google 18 product? 19 Google products are Google Search, Google Maps, Google 20 Mail. I think everybody knows. 21 22 Is there anybody that's never used a Google product? 23 The marketing people will be very happy about that. Is there anybody on the flip side, anybody that's been 24 25 unhappy with a Google product, or had a problem that was

```
significant that caused them concern or inconvenience, or cost
 1
     them money? Again, with any of the Google products that we're
 2
     all familiar with.
 3
          Has anybody dealt with Google in any way? You've met with
 4
 5
     Google sales folks, other than just in the course of using
     Google products. Does anybody deal on a regular basis with
 6
     anybody from Google?
 7
          How about from Oracle -- yes, Mr. Haley.
 8
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Point of clarification.
 9
                                                                  Ι
     do have my next-door neighbor. He's head of worldwide
10
11
    marketing for applied computing.
              MR. VAN NEST: For Oracle?
12
13
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: For Google.
              MR. VAN NEST: For Google.
14
          Okay. Do you speak with him often about work? Are you
15
16
     close friends?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Seldom. Basic neighbor
17
     talk.
18
              MR. VAN NEST: That wouldn't influence your thinking
19
20
     in this case?
21
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY:
              MR. VAN NEST: He's not a close friend --
22
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY:
23
                                       No.
              MR. VAN NEST: -- or anything like that?
24
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY:
25
                                        No.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
MR. VAN NEST: On the same vein, has anybody dealt
with people from Oracle? Salespeople or marketing people or
the field application people.
     Ms. Hines. Tell us about that.
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: So, at PG&E our main billing
system is owned by Oracle. And so if we make enhancements, we
work with consultants from their side to get that work, the
code in and completed.
        MR. VAN NEST: That's something you did personally --
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: Uh-huh.
        MR. VAN NEST: -- with them?
    And how often were you working with your Oracle
representative?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: It depends on the project.
I've only been on one project where we were working directly
with the Oracle consultant to get the code completed. And that
was last year.
        MR. VAN NEST: Was that a good experience?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES:
                                  Yeah.
        MR. VAN NEST: Any problems, anything like that?
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: Huh-uh.
        MR. VAN NEST: On that project were you seeing your
Oracle representative every day, every week, every month?
often --
        PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: We had weekly status
```

meetings. 1 MR. VAN NEST: Would that cause you any concern in 2 terms of sitting in a case where Oracle is one party and Google 3 is the other party? 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: No. MR. VAN NEST: This didn't become a close friendship 6 7 or anything like that? PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: No. 8 MR. VAN NEST: This is just business. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: Yes. 10 MR. VAN NEST: You don't think that would enter into 11 your thinking at all? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HINES: 13 No. MR. VAN NEST: Thank you, Ms. Hines. 14 15 Anybody else? 16 Mr. Stromsness. 17 **PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS:** Years ago, at the 18 Performing Arts Center at UC Berkeley, Sun Microsystems 19 sponsored a dance series, and worked with us with some loaned 20 hardware to put up a Gopher server. For people who remember 21 back. And then the person who worked with us there sent me --22 you know, cold-called me sometimes after that before she went 23 to work for HP. But that's it. That was 20 years ago. 24 25 MR. VAN NEST: Okay. And a long time ago. That was

Sun? 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: That was Sun, yeah. 2 MR. VAN NEST: Anybody else have experience? 3 Mr. Haley. 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: I apologize. I triggered my 6 thought process. We did run Oracle Financials. 7 MR. VAN NEST: We did what? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: My company ran Oracle 9 Financials. So we had a whole implementation scheme. This was 10 11 probably 2001-2002, sometime in that time frame. So at that point I did have a fair amount of interface 12 13 with them, when we were doing that. Can't recall any specifics in terms of people and names. 14 MR. VAN NEST: So you may have interacted with folks 15 16 from Oracle? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Sure. MR. VAN NEST: But that was quite a long time ago? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: Sure, yes. 19 MR. VAN NEST: And that doesn't give you any pause in 20 terms of sitting on this case and being fair? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY: 22 No. 23 MR. VAN NEST: Thank you for bringing it up. Google is in the news a lot. Oracle is in the news too. 24 Has anybody read anything about Google recently that they 25

4

6

25

```
think would impact their thinking to this case? I'm not
 1
     limiting to this case. Judge Alsup has made clear we are not
     to be doing that.
 3
          But has anybody read anything about Google recently that
 5
     they think might impact their thinking about this case?
          Okay.
                 Good.
          Has -- has -- do any of you work for companies -- and,
 7
    Mr. Haley, I'm going to hold on, on you, on this one because
 8
     you've already said something about it. So I'm going to exempt
 9
     you from answering it.
10
11
          Does anybody else have any responsibility for intellectual
     property where they work? By that I mean patents or copyrights
12
13
     or trademarks or any of that. Just give me a hand up.
          Nobody?
14
          What I'm asking about is if anyone at work -- not at
15
16
     home -- has any responsibility for either getting patents or
     filing patents or copyrights or that sort of thing.
17
          Okay. Very good.
18
          I'm going to ask one of our new jurors.
19
          Ms. Yasumoto, good afternoon.
20
          You said you're deputy county counsel. Give us a little
21
22
     discussion about your range of responsibilities at the County.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: So I either handle or
23
     oversee all of our employment litigation. And also oversee all
24
```

of our legal services to our Health and Human Services Agency,

```
which is an integrated super agency.
 1
              MR. VAN NEST: Okay. So the employment. Employment
 2
     litigation, that's usually against the County?
 3
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Against the County, yeah.
 4
 5
     Against employees.
 6
              MR. VAN NEST: And are you --
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Dealing with the union.
 7
              MR. VAN NEST: Are you a supervising attorney on those
 8
 9
     cases?
10
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO:
                                           I am.
11
              MR. VAN NEST: So you're in court?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Arbitration.
12
              MR. VAN NEST: In arbitration. Okay. And is that a
13
     daily activity? Weekly? Monthly?
14
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: I'm not in arbitration
16
     daily or weekly, but I'm handling employment on an ongoing
17
    basis.
              MR. VAN NEST: What about the Health and Human
18
19
     Services side, what's the nature of that work?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Overseeing everything
21
     from LPS trials to juvenile dependency, CPS, mental health
     issues, public health, social services.
22
              MR. VAN NEST: No responsibility for intellectual
23
    property for copyrights or patents or anything like that?
24
25
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO:
                                           No.
```

```
MR. VAN NEST: And have you read anything about this
 1
 2
     case?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO:
 3
              MR. VAN NEST: Let me ask another general question.
 4
 5
     There was talk earlier about billions. And somebody said
     something about agreement.
 6
          I want to make clear that nobody is in agreement about
 7
     billions on this case.
 8
          So I want to ask this question: Is there anybody that
 9
     would not be willing to award nothing if that's what the
10
     evidence showed was correct?
11
          Is there anybody that feels like, gee, they're here; gee,
12
     they're the plaintiff we've got to give them something no
13
     matter what the evidence shows? Is there anybody who has that
14
15
     frame of mind? Everybody is going to wait and hear the
16
     evidence on that subject?
          I didn't want my silence to suggest that I believe this
17
     thing has anything to do with billions. And maybe you guys
18
     assumed that, but I just wanted to be sure.
19
          Now, one of the things that Judge Alsup has mentioned is
20
     fair use. The fair use doctrine and so on.
21
          Does anybody have any familiarity with fair use, or come
22
23
     into contact with it at work or in the course of -- yes, sir,
     Mr. Stromsness.
24
```

PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: At UC Berkeley we would

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

somewhat regularly get, you know, all employee emails reminding -- mainly aimed at professors about what they were allowed to do in their courses, and what they weren't allowed to do in their courses. It didn't really apply to me on the administrative computer support side. MR. VAN NEST: These were general emails? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Yeah, always deans and directors memos, so they went to everyone at the campus. MR. VAN NEST: Do you have enough recollection of any of those to be familiar with fair use? Or is this something you saw in the past? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: I remember that there were four tests, and mainly that they told professors to contact the intellectual property office if they had questions. MR. VAN NEST: Okay, good. And you would be able to set aside anything you remember about that, and follow Judge Alsup's instructions in this case? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Yes. MR. VAN NEST: That wouldn't be a problem for you? PROSPECTIVE JUROR STROMSNESS: Not at all. There will be testimony during the case MR. VAN NEST: about use of software which Google engineers believe was open and free. My question is, is there anybody on the panel that thinks that copying is always wrong, no matter what, no matter what

```
the circumstances are? If you feel that way, give me a hand
 1
 2
     up.
          In other words, what I want to know is, is anybody so
 3
     concerned or offended by someone copying something else, even
 4
 5
     though they felt it was okay to do, that that would be a real
     problem in terms of evaluating evidence fairly and impartially,
 6
     which we all need to do? Anybody feel that way?
 7
          Anybody have a situation where someone copied from you
 8
     and -- and became a big deal?
 9
          Anybody here -- has anybody experienced a situation where
10
11
     you felt that someone, either intentionally or unintentionally,
     copied your work, used your work?
12
13
          Or has anyone here ever been accused of copying or using
14
     anything?
          Or any of your companies, does anyone work for a company
15
16
     that was accused of taking something from someone else?
17
          Mr. Haley, you've already talked about that. That's the
     patent litigation you are talking about.
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HALEY:
                                        (Nods head.)
19
              MR. VAN NEST: Okay. We've heard a little bit about
20
     that. Thank you, though, for volunteering.
21
22
          Anybody else been with a company that was accused of
```

Anyone work at a company that they claim was harmed by competition from someone else, wrongfully so? Any of your

taking something that someone else said belonged to them?

23

24

```
companies, your employers?
 1
          Anybody in a situation where their company felt, hey, this
 2
     other company is not competing fairly, not playing by the
 3
     rules?
 4
 5
          Okay. Good.
                        Great.
          Is there -- is there anyone that feels as though there's
 6
     some question that we haven't asked, that we should have asked
 7
     about you, that might affect your thinking about this case?
 8
          I know that's pretty open-ended. But what I'm trying to
 9
     get at is, you guys have been very patient listening to the
10
11
     questions and responding to them.
          Does anybody have anything they think should be discussed
12
     or brought up for either party, that hasn't come up yet, that
13
     we haven't asked you about yet?
14
15
          May I have just a moment, Your Honor?
16
           (Pause)
              MR. VAN NEST: I have no further questions, Your
17
18
     Honor.
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
19
          Mr. Bicks, I was going to give you a moment. But before I
20
     do that, Ms. Huynh, I want to make sure that we understand
21
22
     something.
23
          You live with your parents; right?
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
24
                                        Yes.
25
              THE COURT: So when your dad finds out that you're on
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
this case, assuming that you get selected, he might be tempted
to say something because he owns some stock in one or the other
companies.
     And you would need to tell him you can't -- you're not
going to talk about it, you don't want him to -- do you think
he would honor that? Or do you think he would be so tempted to
say something to you that we couldn't stop him?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: I think he would understand
that I wouldn't be able to say anything to him about this case.
         THE COURT: All right. So will you tell him that?
Say, look, Dad, I just can't talk about this case?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: Yeah. I don't -- I wouldn't
tell him that I'm on the case. So I don't think he would ask
me.
         THE COURT: All right. Well, if he did find out and
he did say something to you that, hey, he owned stock in Oracle
or he owned stock in Google, can you promise us that you will
completely disregard that and decide -- in deciding this case.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: Yes. I'm not even sure if
he owns stock.
                     I know you're not sure. But if it did
         THE COURT:
turn out that way, and if he did blurt it out in some manner,
would you promise us that you will disregard that statement?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
                                  Yes.
         THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Bicks, did you have any -- I'll give you a few more minutes to ask some questions of the new arrivals on the panel. Thank you, Your Honor. MR. BICKS: Good afternoon. Ms. Yasumoto, you described that you, I think, were a foreperson on a jury before. PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: That's correct. MR. BICKS: And, just, how was that experience? PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Interesting. (Laughter) Tell me about that. MR. BICKS: PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: Well, being on the other side, seeing it from completely different vantage points. MR. BICKS: Understood. Anything about that that would influence anything on this case if you sat on it? PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: No. MR. BICKS: You mentioned, I think, you're more typically on the defense side rather than the plaintiff side. PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: It depends. guess -- I guess that's probably an accurate statement. MR. BICKS: Anything about that -- we're over here. We're on the plaintiff's side. And some people -- nothing wrong with it, but sometimes there's some people kind of feel one way or the other they don't like people on the plaintiff's

```
McDonald's coffee example.
 1
     side.
          Any kind of orientation on your part that puts you more,
 2
     kind of, leaning toward the defense side rather than
 3
     plaintiff's side?
 4
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO: I don't think so.
 5
              MR. BICKS: Just to our new three folks, just because
 6
 7
     I didn't have a chance to speak with you as with the others, I
     was focused on a couple of key things, which are people that --
 8
     you know, that we're requesting a very, very high amount of
 9
     damages. And any concerns about that among, any of the three
10
11
     of you?
          Ms. Davis, anything, when I mention that?
12
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS:
13
                                       (Inaudible.)
              MR. BICKS: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.
14
              THE COURT:
                          Give her the mic.
15
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: They always seem like high
16
17
     amount of damages to me.
              MR. BICKS: Yeah. And explain what you mean by that.
18
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Well, every time I see a
19
20
     business lawsuit, they just always seem high. But I don't have
     any feeling about it one way or the other as far as if it's
21
     right or wrong.
22
23
              MR. BICKS:
                         Understood.
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: Just like another
24
     billion-dollar lawsuit.
25
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
But when you say that, in your -- kind of,
         MR. BICKS:
your heart, are you sitting there thinking, you know, You folks
should have worked this out?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS: No.
                                        I don't read the
business section. I don't -- I'm not really involved in
business or sports. Those are the two things I don't get into.
                    Ms. Huynh, anything, any concerns or --
        MR. BICKS:
about sitting on a case, if you were on it, where we're asking
for those kind of damages?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH:
                                  No.
         THE COURT:
                    Microphone.
        MR. BICKS: On Oracle, kind of, anything negative that
either of the three of you, kind of, heard, feel, see, as we've
been in the room talking, that you think the folks at Oracle or
I should know about, something that would be important in this
case?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR HUYNH: No, not from me.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR YASUMOTO:
                                      (Shakes head.)
                    Thank you, Your Honor.
        MR. BICKS:
         THE COURT:
                     Thank you, Mr. Bicks.
     Okay. Again, I ask you, full disclosure time, anything
you want to volunteer to put it out there for us to evaluate
just out of an abundance of caution? If so, raise your hand.
     So if you are selected, you must listen carefully and
impartially -- meaning fair to both sides -- to all the
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

evidence; and then at the end of the case lay the evidence alongside the elements of proof that I will give you; and then ask the question whether or not the party with the burden of proof has carried the burden of proof under the law. the answer is yes, then they win. If the answer is no, then they lose. And are you all able to do that and to do that fairly and impartially? If so, raise your hand. (Show of hands.) THE COURT: Okay. Everyone has raised their hand. Okay. Can we pass the panel for cause? MR. VAN NEST: May I approach, Your Honor? THE COURT: All right. We will have a sidebar. (The following proceedings were heard at the sidebar:) THE COURT: All right. Can we pass the panel for cause? MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, I think Ms. Shattuck, again has indicated an inability to comprehend and follow this testimony and evidence like this. And she's expressed in a number of different ways that she is not capable of following technical testimony about computers. And that's, of course, what we're going to be talking about. She said it both in Mr. Bicks' questions, she said it in my questions. She said it in your questions. she said it most clearly in my questions that she just doesn't

understand.

And I think that, given we want the jurors that understand and can follow evidence, she should be stricken, excused.

MR. BICKS: I don't think that's right, Your Honor.

This woman has a degree from Berkeley and is clearly a very bright, thoughtful person. I don't believe the standard is we have to have all tech savvy people on a jury.

When you asked her could she be fair, she said she could.

I think she's in here feeling a little bit, kind of,
intimidated. And I don't mean it in an overt physical way.

But I just don't see that. That's a smart person. I don't think that's the standard. I really don't.

THE COURT: Can I make a ruling?

MR. BICKS: Yeah.

MR. VAN NEST: Sure.

THE COURT: Denied. The -- I agree that she's probably on the lower half of the ability of the 16 people to understand the technology. But that's not the test. Under the law, we can't exclude her for that reason.

And she is bright enough and I think she will try hard to understand it. And there are certainly other people on the jury that I have equal doubts about, that I won't tell you who they are. But I think there are several on the jury who have even less chance of grasping it. So I will never get a jury that's technically savvy.

```
Anyway, that motion is denied.
 1
 2
          All right. Anyone else?
              MR. VAN NEST: No, Your Honor.
 3
              MR. BICKS:
 4
                          No.
 5
              THE COURT:
                         Anyone on your side?
              MR. BICKS:
                          No.
 6
 7
              THE COURT:
                         Do you understand the process that we're
     going to go through now?
 8
                          It may be worth explaining it.
 9
              MR. BICKS:
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. So you go first, Mr. Bicks.
10
                                                              You
11
     stand and excuse whoever you want. Then it goes to --
     challenge goes to Van Nest. Then back to you until each of you
12
    have done three.
13
          If you pass, you do not -- you've used it. You don't get
14
15
     a chance to go back and retrieve it. It's gone forever.
16
     if there are two consecutive passes, then the lowest ten seat
17
    numbers will be the jury.
              MR. BICKS: In other words, you stand up and you do
18
         We don't exchange -- we don't give you a list of three?
19
20
                         No, no. You have to do it in open court.
              THE COURT:
    And you don't give a reason. You just --
21
22
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             Thank and excuse.
              THE COURT: You thank and excuse.
23
              MR. VAN NEST: Ask the Court to thank and excuse.
24
25
              THE COURT:
                          You give the names. And you don't give a
```

```
You just do it.
 1
     reason.
 2
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             Yeah.
                          And you get to go first as the plaintiff.
              THE COURT:
 3
                          And do I have a chance to confer with our
              MR. BICKS:
 4
 5
     client?
                         Yeah, take -- how long do you need though?
              THE COURT:
 6
                          Ten minutes?
 7
              MR. BICKS:
                          Then I have to -- I'm going to -- well, do
              THE COURT:
 8
     you want the jury here while you do that? Maybe you do.
 9
              MR. BICKS: Whatever -- maybe we can just go out in
10
11
     the hallway. It's not going to take a long time, but I just
     feel --
12
13
              THE COURT:
                         Ten minutes is a long time. How about
     five minutes?
14
                         All right. Let's do that.
15
              MR. BICKS:
16
              THE COURT:
                         All right. I'll give you five minutes.
     And I'll just keep the jury here.
17
                          Thank you.
18
              MR. BICKS:
19
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
              MR. VAN NEST: Thank you, Your Honor.
20
          (Sidebar concluded.)
21
              THE COURT: Let me explain to all of you what is about
22
23
     to happen.
          The lawyers, in just a few moments -- I'm giving them five
24
25
     minutes to consult -- will stand and excuse three per side, up
```

```
to three per side. And then the remaining ten will be the jury.

So they are going -- I'm letting them step into the hallway so they can make their final decision. So it's just
```

best if you sit tight for a moment.

And then all of those in the back of the room, probably I'm not going to need you, but you need to stay here just in case.

So I'm giving them a few moments. It will save time if I just ask you to sit there. And if you have a book, read it for a few minutes. And you can go on and consult your emails and so forth.

But don't talk about the case, of course. And just bear with us while we let the lawyers make their best estimates as to what the right thing to do is.

(Pause)

THE COURT: All right. Now, Counsel, are we ready to proceed?

MR. VAN NEST: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. BICKS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Before we proceed, I just want you, over there in the jury box, to appreciate that we are about to make the decisions about who gets to stay on the jury and not.

So if there is anything you feel you've got to raise your

```
hand and tell us, do it now. You cannot do it after these
 1
     lawyers make their selections.
 2
          All right. So based upon that, at this time, Oracle
 3
     has -- the challenge lies with Oracle.
 4
 5
              MR. BICKS:
                          Thank you, Your Honor. So Oracle thanks
     and excuses juror 1, Mr. Stromsness.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: All right. Mr. Stromsness, you're
     excused. Please go back to the jury assembly room and tell
 8
 9
     them you've been excused. Have a great day. Thank you very
     much.
10
11
          And, now, the challenge lies with Google.
              MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, Google would ask the Court
12
13
     to thank and excuse juror number 4, Mr. West.
14
              THE COURT: Mr. West, you're excused with thanks to
15
     the Court.
16
          Please go back to the jury assembly room and tell them
17
     what happened.
          The challenge lies with Oracle.
18
              MR. BICKS: Oracle thanks and excuses juror number 5,
19
20
    Mr. Wong.
              THE COURT: Mr. Wong, thank you. You're free to go.
21
     Go back to the jury assembly room and tell them what happened.
22
```

MR. VAN NEST: Your Honor, we would request that you

thank and excuse juror number 12, Mr. Bruesewitz.

Google.

23

24

```
THE COURT: Mr. Bruesewitz, thank you. You're free to
go. And go back to the jury assembly room and tell them what
happened.
And now Oracle.

MR. BICKS: Oracle thanks and excuses juror number 8,
```

Ms. Huynh. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Huynh, you're free to go back to the jury assembly room. Tell them what happened.

The final challenge lies with Google.

MR. VAN NEST: Just a moment, Your Honor.

Your Honor, Google requests that the Court thank and excuse juror number 16, Ms. Kreslake.

THE COURT: Ms. Kreslake; right? You're free to go back to the jury assembly room. We thank you very much.

Please have a great day.

All right. So would you two please move down these two seats.

And then, Ms. Harper, I'm going to ask you to come around and take the fifth seat.

And then you three scoot down one seat each. Yes, you three over there, we're consolidating. Move over.

Okay. See how we've got two rows of five? That's it.

Two times five is ten.

Congratulations. You're going to be the jury to decide

25 this case.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

```
At this time, please stand and raise your right hand.
 1
 2
          (Jurors sworn.)
              THE COURT: Thank you. Have a seat.
 3
          At this time what I'm going to do is ask you to go into
 4
 5
     the -- let me just make sure, so far everything is cool; right?
 6
     We did it right? I excused the right people?
           (Laughter)
 7
              MR. VAN NEST: You did, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: Okay.
 9
                                 Good.
              MR. VAN NEST: Just right.
10
11
              THE COURT:
                          Right?
                         Everything is cool.
12
              MR. BICKS:
13
           (Laughter)
              THE COURT: All right. Now, what we're going to do is
14
15
     introduce you to your new home away from home, which is behind
16
     this door.
17
          And every morning, when you get here by 7:45, and --
     you're over there acting like something is wrong, Ms. Davis.
18
19
     What's the problem?
20
              PROSPECTIVE JUROR DAVIS:
              THE COURT: You're in shock?
21
22
           (Laughter)
23
              THE COURT: Well, it's like the Army. Okay.
     When you arrive by 7:45, I get you hot coffee. It's going to
24
25
     be there. And federal doughnuts. And you will enjoy being in
```

the jury room.

And then you'll enjoy the trial even more. We have these great lawyers. You're going to see a very good performance by both sides.

So what we're going to do is, you get to go back in there and she's going to give you a badge. She's going to give you a spiral notebook to take notes in. And she will give you some instructions on how to get in here in the morning. And then you'll be on your way.

And I'm not going to bring the jury back in today, but I do-- is that all right, Counsel? Or do you want me to bring them back in for more admonitions?

MR. BICKS: No, no that's fine.

MR. VAN NEST: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I do want to give you a couple of admonitions.

You are going to be deciding an important case. You cannot let anyone talk with you. There are people out there in the -- not these people, not the lawyers or -- but there are people out there who are propagandists and have views about things. And if they were to come and try to talk to you about this case, I would put them in jail. And you would need to let me know that they had done that.

So you have to stay pure and don't talk with anyone about this case. And don't do any research about this case. And

```
don't put on your Facebook or Twitter or any of those things
that you have anything to do with this case. That's really --
I have to give you that direct order to make sure that we
protect the integrity of this trial. So that's the main thing.
```

I want you to -- the flu season is behind us, thankfully. But wash your hands like crazy. Don't get the flu. Don't get sick because then we have to slow down the trial and maybe not -- you know, and it goes past June 10th. So stay healthy.

And the great thing about a trial is you don't have to do any homework. You sit back and see what the lawyers convince you of or don't convince you of. And so you just have to pay close attention and follow the law. That's your main obligation in life right now. At least in the courtroom.

Okay. Counsel, I'm going to send them back to the jury room unless you want me to say anything more.

MR. BICKS: We're fine. Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. VAN NEST: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And then you get to go out to the secret passageway out of here. And then don't let any member of the press -- there are people out there, members of the press -- actually, they're pretty high standards and a lot of integrity. They're not going to do it. But you cannot talk to anybody.

After the case is over and I've discharged you, you can hold a press conference.

All right. We'll see you here tomorrow at 7:45 or

earlier. 1 THE CLERK: All rise. 2 (Jury out at 1:31 p.m.) 3 Okay. Be seated. 4 THE COURT: 5 Now, Counsel, as for all of the people in the back of the room, who were excellent candidates to serve on the jury, I'm 6 7 just going to say that they can take their questionnaire with We don't need to collect it at this point; is that 8 9 correct? MR. VAN NEST: That's fine, Your Honor. 10 11 THE COURT: Right. 12 MR. BICKS: Yes. 13 THE COURT: Okay. Good. So all of you who still have your questionnaire, you can leave the clipboard with us, but 14 15 you are free to take your questionnaire with you. And we will 16 never know what you put on there because at this point we don't 17 need to know. But let me add this final word. I have been in this job, 18 now, 17 years. And before that I was -- a quarter of a century 19 I was a trial lawyer. And I must say the willingness of good 20 citizens to come and serve their country by serving on a jury, 21 22 I see it all the time, and it's the most inspiring part about 23 the whole process. So I thank you very much for your willingness to serve. 24 25 And I hope you have a great day. And good luck to you.

```
we'll get you on another case sometime in the future.
 1
                                                             So
 2
    bye-bye.
          (Venire exit courtroom.)
 3
              THE COURT: Okay. Everyone have a seat.
 4
 5
          At this point, even the people discharged, they're free to
     stay. They're back to being civilians if they want to stay.
 6
          Listen. What can I do for you before we break for the
 7
     day? We're all set for our openings tomorrow?
 8
              MR. VAN NEST: We are, Your Honor. I don't think
 9
     there's anything else to take up today.
10
11
              THE COURT:
                         Right?
                         Nothing. Thank you.
12
              MR. BICKS:
13
              THE COURT: All right. So probably by 8 o'clock we'll
     be under way with opening. You go first. Van Nest goes
14
15
     second.
16
              MR. BICKS:
                         Yes.
17
              THE COURT: Then we will get in some of the actual
18
     evidence. And we'll break at 1:00 o'clock tomorrow.
          So do you have your electronic equipment ready to go so it
19
20
     doesn't break down and that kind of thing?
21
              MR. VAN NEST: We hope so.
22
           (Laughter)
23
              MR. VAN NEST:
                             We hope so.
              MR. BICKS: We'll find out.
24
25
              MR. VAN NEST: We've got our own equipment. Let's put
```

1	it that way.
2	MR. BICKS: I understand everything is in order. It
3	was checked out in good order.
4	THE COURT: So my assignment overnight is to try to
5	see if I can get some of your deposition read-ins ruled on.
6	MR. VAN NEST: We won't need those, obviously, until
7	Wednesday, Your Honor, I don't believe.
8	THE COURT: All right.
9	Well, then, good luck to both sides. We'll see you
10	tomorrow.
11	MR. VAN NEST: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	(At 1:35 p.m. the proceedings were adjourned until
13	Tuesday, May 10, 2016.)
14	
15	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTERS
16	We certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
17	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
18	DATE: May 9, 2016
19	
20	Kathering Sullivan
21	
22	Katherine Powell Sullivan, CSR #5812, RMR, CRR
23	U.S. Court Reporter
24	Pamela A. Batalo
25	Pamela A. Batalo, CSR No. 3593, RMR, FCRR U.S. Court Reporter